Call number

Forbes Collection

Author **Sydenham, C.**

Date of request **July 30, 1974**

Title **A Christian sober and plain exercitation ...**

Vol. No. ____ Date of vol. **1657** Pages (Incl.) **whole book**

Total No. of pages _____ Column No. (if necessary) _____

This is copy:
A (accompanies material)
B (customer's receipt)
C (departmental record)

INSTRUCTIONS: **Please make negative and positive microfilms and send both to RBD**

PLEASE RETURN MATERIAL TO:

I hereby agree to the conditions printed on the reverse side of this form

Name (print) **RBD Administrative** Signature _____

University status _____ Address or Dept. _____ Telephone _____

For Library use only:

Order received by (Name, Dept.) **RBD/MG/rf**

Charges:
Photocopy _____ @ _____
Microfilm _____ @ _____
Service _____
Postage _____
Total _____

Library
of the
University of Toronto

4 175

Virgil hora
ova labora
spe Expecta

Jacobi Fer[illegible]

[illegible]ma septima.

Ecclesiastes Fecit

Ecclesiastes septima.

A

CHRISTIAN,

SOBER and PLAIN

EXERCITATION

ON

The two grand practical Controversies of these Times;

INFANT-BAPTISM,

AND

SINGING OF PSALMS.

Wherein all the Scriptures on both sides are recited, opened and argued, with brevity and tenderness: and whatever hath been largely discussed by others, briefly contracted in a special method for the edification of the SAINTS.

By *Cuthbert Sidenham*, Teacher to a Church of Christ in *Newcastle* upon *Tine*.

LONDON,

Printed by *Thomas Mabb*, and are to be sold by *Francis Tyton* at the *three Daggers* in *Fleet-street*, neer the *Inner-Temple-gate*. 1657.

To his dear and honoured

Brother, Mr. *William Durant*, my faithfull Fellow-labourer in the Gospel; And the Church of Christ, over whom the Holy Ghost hath made us Joynt-overseers.

Dearly Beloved,

I *Present you these first-fruits of my poor labours, as a pledge of my love, and testimony of my unfeigned desires and longings after your settlement, and comfort together. I am indeared to you in the bowels of Christ, and for his sake ow my self unto you: My highest ambition in this world is, to see you stablished in truth, and flourishing in the glorious graces of the Gospel. I have treated on these two subjects, because I know they are the tempting errours of these Times, and have the faireſt glosses set on them, and have too much influence to disturb the Peace and*

Order of Churches: The first especially, which eats out mens affections, and creeps at the heart like a Gangrene insensibly; an opinion which hath been alwayes ominous, and of a wonderfull strange influence, accompanied with the most dangerous retinue of errours, since the first Embryo of it was brought forth; whether by a judgment of God, or from its natural and secret connexion with other principles of darknesse, I will not determine; onely God hath shewed some black characters on it in every Nation where it hath prevailed; though we cannot but say, many Saints are innocently under the power of it.

For the second, I hope when mens hearts come in tune, their voyces will likewise: The former denies more Fundamental Principles, as the Covenant in its extent, and subjects; the freeness of Grace; the riches of its workings in the New Testament; and contracts the Gospel; leaving more Grace visible in the Legal and Old Testament dispensation, then in the New.

I have only summed up what others express more at large, with something new, and never yet touched, that I know of: And as to the method,

thod, all is new, and made fit for your use, if Christ set it home on you. I have nothing else to add, but to tell you, you have been yet kept pure in the midst of many Distractions, and the violence of desperate Opinions: Take heed of plausible errours that come painted to you with the name of the most glorious truths: Lose not your glory at last; try and weigh every tittle that is propounded: Its my desire you may have the glorious Title given to you the Bereans had, to be (ευγενέστεροι) men of better breeding then to take up any thing on trust, though from the Apostles themselves, untill you know how they were inspired: Compare Scripture with Scripture; do not distract your selves in the Gospel; lay truths together, they will shine in their proper glory: Part not so easily with antient entailed priviledges: Have so much pity to your Children, as not to blot their names out of Heaven by your own hands, until God do it by soveraignty; do not bury them alive: Those that know the riches of such a priviledge, will not easily part with it upon such poor terms as most propose. I plead for poor Infants; and its but charity to speak for those whose tongues are tied. I intend brevity in this, as in all the following Discourse.

The Epiſtle Dedicatory.

The Lord fill you with wiſdom and underſtanding, and give you to know what his perfect will is, and hearts to obey it: And thrive like Saints of the New Teſtament, that lie at Chriſts breaſts night and day. *Theſe are the deſires of*

Your unworthy Teacher,

Cuthbert Sidenham.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Several Conſiderations premiſed, as an entrance to the Diſcourſe.

BEFORE I enter on the main Queſtions handled in this Diſcourſe, it will not be unneceſſary to premiſe ſomething in general concerning this Controverſie, which is ſuch a bone of contention among the Saints, for to make our way clear before us.

And 1. Let this be conſidered, that there is nothing in all the N. T. againſt the baptizing of Infants, not one hint from any expreſs word dropt from Chriſt or his Apoſtles; not one phraſe, which, though never ſo much ſtrain'd, doth forbid ſuch an act: but there is much for it in divers Scriptures compared together; and what is wanting in the one, is ſupplied in another abundantly, as hereafter will appear.

2. The ſum of all that our Oppoſites have to ſay, though they make a great deal of noiſe in the world, is only this, that they can find no ſyllabical precept, or word of command in terms, ſaying, Go baptize Infants; or any poſitive example where it is ſaid in ſo many words, Infants were baptized; only actual believers, as they believed, were baptized: all that they ſay beſides, is onely to quarrel with our arguments, and make ſhift to evade the ſtrength of them, but this is their onely argument, and their All; for however they talk of the Covenant, and fleſhly and ſpiritual ſeed, yet this is the *Goliahs* ſword, none like to it; I would therefore fairly encounter with it in the Portal, that I may ſee all their ſtrength before me.

Concerning which, take in theſe conſiderations: Firſt, this argument is built on this falſe principle, That no direct conſequences from Scripture are mandatory, and ſo obliging, nor of Divine Authority, which all Orthodox Profeſſors and Divines grant, but theſe which are againſt Infants-baptiſm; and it is moſt clear: For,

1. The way to know Scriptures, is by comparing them together, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13. and this muſt needs be by their Harmonie, and by deduction from one to another.

2. Without True conſequence were as Scripture, no one could ſpeak truth, but theſe that ſpeak juſt the very expreſſions of Scripture.

3. There could be no ſpiritual reaſons nor arguments uſed in any Diſcourſe to be of any force or con-

ſequence, though from the Scripture; for there can be no arguing from Scripture, but by conſequences and deduction; for in all arguments there muſt be a medium and a concluſion, a propoſition and an inference.

4. Nothing upon this account can be Scripture, but the very letters and ſyllables in the Bible; nothing of the meaning or ſenſe is Scripture; for you muſt draw out the ſenſe and meaning from the letters by rational conſequence, as the concluſion from a propoſition by a fit medium; and how abſurd would this prove, that letters ſhould be Scripture, and not the ſenſe? and ſo it muſt be according to that Maxime of theirs.

5. This is againſt all preaching, and expounding Scripture; nothing muſt be read but the very bare characters for to draw any deductions from; it is to no purpoſe, though never ſo direct and full; for if they be not Scripture, they cannot bind conſciences; and to what end is preaching, but to open and apply Scripture?

6. The ſearching of the Scripture were the moſt uſeleſs undertaking that could be imagined; for what need I ſearch, but read? for no conſequence, by compariſon of Scripture, is of authority to ſatisfy my conſcience, if I draw a concluſion from a Text, and perceive the meaning of it to be thus: if nothing without it be laid down in ſo many ſyllables, how many ſuch ſtrange abſurdities would follow the denying conſequences from ſcripture, which are purely de-

deducted? and by this principle, that where there are not ſo many letters put together in one ſentence, there is no command, men would ſoon draw Religion into a very narrow compaſſe.

7. This would be as much againſt themſelves; For,

Firſt, They have no command in ſo many words, Go and baptize actual or viſible believers: if they ſay ſuch were baptized: its anſwered, that is not to the purpoſe: for its a verbal command required by them to give warrant to an ordinance.

Secondly, *That* they muſt prove by conſequence alſo, believers were baptized, *Ergo* there was a command: Neither,

Thirdly, Can they prove one act concerning their own form of baptizing by any command, but by conſequences: When they ſay Infants are not to be baptized, they draw it from conſequence thus, becauſe there is no command in their ſenſe; When they affirm the Covenant is not made with believers now, and their ſeed, as with *Abraham*, its drawn by conſequence, becauſe, ſay they, *Abraham* is no natural father to us, as to the Jews, and becauſe that covenant was a mixt Covenant, &c. When they come to prove baptizing to be by plunging, they argue by conſequence, becauſe the word ſignifies it, becauſe they went where much water was, and went down into the water. &c. though they are miſtaken in all their conſequences, as I ſhall hereafter ſhew: yet this is full *ad hominem*, and againſt themſelves, who

who deny conſequences to warrant inſtitutions, and yet have nothing for to prove their own way, but what is by conſequence from Scripture.

8. Its common among the Apoſtles to argue in ſuch a method, and to deduce one thing from another, to make out what they intended; 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. *We thus judge, if Chriſt died for all, then all are dead*; if the firſt be true, then the latter; ſo 1 *Cor.* 15. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. and all that Chapter, arguing out the reſurrection by fit mediums: ſo about the Ordinance of Baptiſm, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, why theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we*? There was never any command to baptize theſe that had received the holy Ghoſt, not any example of any baptized on theſe terms; but the Apoſtle argues from the equivalency of the mercy, and the reaſon of the ſtate they were in; the ſame method he uſes 1 *Cor.* 10. 15, 16, 17, 18. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17, 18.

9. There will be hardly found a definition of the moſt doctrinal and high myſteries of the Goſpel, but by comparing Scripture with Scripture, and ſo making it forth by conſequence: what perfect definition of juſtification, or of juſtifying faith, in ſo many formal expreſſions in all the N. T. but what muſt be deducted by comparing Scriptures together to make one reſult? where are women either by ſuch a wordy expreſſion commanded to receive the Lords Supper? or any example? if they ſay (ἄνθρωπος) ing-

signifies both sexes, yet it's still by consequence, no command or example: and why not (ἁγιοι) as fit to signifie Infant Saints as grown Saints, Infant-holiness, as perfect holiness? it's applied to both; if they will stick at a syllable, we may stick with them on the same grounds.

10. Deny consequences to have the strength of commands, and you will leave very few duties to be practis'd, or sins to be avoided in the Old or New Testament: Expound the ten Commandements the sum of the Law, without consequences, and very few shall be found litteral transgressors, but most desperate debauched persons. *Mat.* 5. Christ expounds the whole Law, and by consequences from the inward meaning, draws out new considerations of duties: and since the Bible is but a short systeme of Religion, every place is fitted to expound each other; and this must be done by rational-spiritual comparisons and inferences: but enough to the first consideration on this head of commands and consequences.

2 Where we have a promise laid as the foundation of a duty that is equivalent to any expres command: for as commands in the Gospel do suppose promises, to encourage us to act them, and help us in them: so promises made to persons do include commands, especially when the duties commanded are annexed to the promises, as all New Testament Ordinances are, as well as Old.

3. We have as much in the N. T. to prove Infant-baptism, from the true principles of right to Ordi-

Ordinances, as they have for these whom they baptize; for they baptize grown persons on such and such considerations: and we shall hereafter shew, we baptize on as strong and equivalent grounds; and thats enough to warrant a command, to demonstrate the same substantial grounds of the command to reach the same case.

4. If we can find no positive command in so many words for their baptizing (shewing the same fundamental grounds) it's requisite they should shew us some expres command to the contrary, and some authentick repeal, seeing Infants so long enjoyed such a like Ordinance: Upon the same grounds Christ would not have taken away such an ancient priviledge, when his grace abounded, and superabounded, but he would have left some characters of it in the Gospel, and entred some formal discharge in his Word of such persons, and given a warning of it to the Gentile-beleivers to expect it; but he hath both by his words and carriages left clear demonstrations, that he is so far from repealing, as he confirms it to Infants; let the Scriptures opened hereafter speak to this.

The third consideration premised is this, as all that they urge as to examples of actual believers, being baptized, all along the New Testament, especially the *Acts*, and that if thou believest thou mayest, &c. we can freely grant without any damage to this truth: For,

1. We say as they, professing believers, grown

men

men were first baptized, and so they ought to be, who are to be the first subjects of the administration of an Ordinance, persons able to give an account of their own faith; it was so with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 24. he was 99. years old when he was circumcised, and he must be first circumcised before he could convey a right to his seed; now you may as well argue, *Abraham* was first circumcised when so old, therefore old persons are to be circumcised, and none else; as because grown persons were baptized, therefore not Infants, when they must be first baptized themselves; for Children are baptized by the promise first to them, and in them to their seed.

2. An affirmative position is not exclusive of subordinates; because believers were said to be baptized, *Ergo* not their seed, is not true reasoning; for their seed were comprehended with them in the same promise.

3. *A non dicto ad non factum, non valet consequentia*, as Divines say: because its not expresst in so many words, therefore it was not done, is no argument: especially when there is enough to shew it was done, though not written; Christ speaks short, that we may search, he expects N.T. Saints to be so ingenuous as to take more by a hint, than those of the Old, who were not so bred as we now; they had every pin of the Tabernacle appointed; its not so punctually set down now, either as to Churches, or Government, but onely the main substantials laid down, and its left to the ingenuity of the Saints to draw forth the consequences. Lastly

Lastly, to premise no more; God hath alwayes ordained some Ordinances; in the administration of which, for the most part, the subject hath been purely passive, to expresse his own free grace most eminently as Circumcision on Infants; And can we think he hath left no Ordinance now as a visible character, only to hold forth his meer grace in the N. T. where he reigns by grace? And there is no sign so fit to expresse it as Baptism, and no subject so capable as poor Infants.

CHAP. II.

About the nature of the Covenant made with Abraham.

THE first great thing in this Controversie is, to consider the nature of the Covenant, which is the first foundation of the priviledge to believers, and their seed, as it was first made with *Abraham* and his seed, in the name of all believers, and their seed both Jews and Gentiles; for so large is the extent of that Covenant to both, as hereafter shall be proved from New Testament expressions; and if we find the same Covenant reaching Gentile-believers, and their Children, as *Abraham* and his, we cannot be denyed the new external sign and seal of the same

Cove-

Covenant; for though the outward ſignes may be changed, yet there is no change of the priviledges, if the Covenant remain entire. For the opening of which we ſhall conſider,

1. The nature of *Abrahams* Covenant.
2. How perſons may be ſaid to be in that Covenant.

For the firſt, we muſt begin with that place *Gen.* 17. where God began not onely to expreſſe the Covenant in larger terms than formerly, but to adde a viſible ſeal to it, *viz.* that of Circumciſion: There be many conjectures about this Covenant; thoſe that differ, conceive it to be a mixt Covenant, made up of ſpiritual and temporal bleſſings together, and not of the ſame purity with the Covenant in the New Teſtament, and ſo make a carnal part, and a ſpiritual part of it, and Circumciſion to be annexed eſpecially to the former, not ſo to the latter; this is the true relation of their judgement about this. Let us review the Covenant, and its terms, and we ſhall ſoon finde the miſtake.

First and chiefly We affirm this was a Covenant of pure grace, the ſame in ſubſtance with the Covenant adminiſtred now under the Goſpel, ſince Chriſts coming in the fleſh and ſpirit.

1. It was founded upon pure grace, Gods love to *Abraham*, and 'tis not any thing in *Abraham*, or his, to move God more than to the Gentiles.

2. It was a Covenant without works, therefore of pure grace, *Rom.* 4.1,2,3,4,5. and all along the Chapter.

3. It

3. It was a Covenant made onely with a Believer upon Goſpel terms; the ſame the New Teſtament holds forth in the 3, 4, and 5. v. of that Chapter; now faith is the onely condition of the Covenant of grace.

4. It was a Covenant made in Chriſt, and therefore a pure Covenant of Grace, as any can be in the Goſpel, *Gal* 3. 16, 17, 18, and 29.

5. Conſider the tenure of this Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7 *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations, to be a God to thee, and thy ſeed after thee.* Here is the ſubſtance and ſtrength of this Covenant, to be a God to *Abraham* and to his ſeed; and what can be more, than to be *Jehovah* to him? can there be any expreſſion more high, or that can ſet forth more grace and purity than this? Its more than can be expreſt, that God engageth his Deity to him; and it is as much as if God had ſaid, whatever I am in mine own Godhead, I will be to thee and thy ſeed, to make you happy and bleſſed: This is the firſt and main thing premiſed, and it comprehends Chriſt, grace, glory, all bleſſings above imagination; the Apoſtle in *Heb.* 8. 10. uſeth the ſame expreſſion as the ſum of all, when he ſpeaks of the new Covenant, *I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me a people.* We need adde no more, if that were not a Covenant of pure grace, the Goſpel knows none other.

That which they have to ſay why it's a mixt Covenant, and a temporal, as ſome of the moſt ignorant

affirm, is from the following expression of *Gen.* 17. 8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a stranger, all the Land of* Canaan, *for an everlasting possession, &c.* Now say they, if the promises be mixt, so is the Covenant.

To which I answer, that the Land of *Canaan*, and such like promises, were but additional, and added *ex superabundanti*, to the first promise, not at all incorporated to the bulk and body of the Covenant which was made in Christ, and consisted of more pure considerations; these promises were but fitted to the outward administration of the first promise of grace, and the state of *Abrahams* family, but there was no mixture; For,

1. The Covenant with *Abraham* is repeated in the New Testament entire, without any of those additions, as is proved formerly.

2. The promise of *Canaan* was typical of heaven, and so did but more open the first promise, to be their God, shewing them that God would bring him and his to Heaven, and the fulness of his glory, as he would bring them to an outward *Canaan*; and this was suited to Gods design, in administring that vast promise by types and outward figures: so *Abraham* closed in with it by faith, as a promise, expounding figuratively the substance of the Covenant, *Heb.* 11. 8, 9, 10. so 13, 14, 15, 16. So that the first promise was positive, and shewed the nature of the covenant; the other was typically expository, *Canaan* setting out Heaven, and the eternity of their rest with this

God

God in Covenant; and this will no more make a mixt Covenant, than the type and the substance when they meet together will differ in signification.

3. We may as well say, these promises in the New Testament make up a mixt Covenant, and so of a different nature, when God saith in *Mat.* 6. 33. *Seek first the Kingdome of God, and all things else shall be added*; and 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Godlinesse hath the promise of this life, and that which is to come*; which are as much mixt as ever the Covenant made with *Abraham* was; whereas all know, these are but accidental appendices of the promise of grace, and dispensed according to the use he hath for, and the conditions of his Saints: thus *Canaan* was added to the Covenant, as all other things to the kingdom of God.

4. If this be a mixt Covenant, because *Canaan* is added, and the like, then how comes it to be the same in the N. T. and to be of force now, when no notice is taken of *Canaan*, and the temporal promises? Sure in this mixture the promise of free grace was primary, and like oyl at top; for *Abrahams* Covenant the very same for substance is clear, and without mixture in the Gospel, though it is administred externally, as it was then, and the blessings of *Abraham* come on the Gentiles, though not of an externall *Canaan*.

If they say that *Canaan* was added onely for the dispensation of the Covenant to the Jews, its granted; but that it should make a mixture in the Cove-

nant

nant,is moſt falſe,which is the ſame for ever,though the outward adminiſtration be different; things may be added, yet not mixt, as a mans cloaths to His body, and yet there is no mixture between a mans fleſh and his cloaths.

But let us come to Circumciſion, the ſeal of this Covenant: it ſealed it, ſay they, as a mixt Covenant.

Then 1. It ſealed the one part aſweil as the other: take it in their own ſenſe, that is,it ſealed God to be their God,as *Canaan*; and ſo it was not a ſeal meerly to a temporal promiſe.

2. If the Covenant was ſo mixt in the nature of it, then Circumciſion ſealed unequally, though it was added to a mixt Covenant,for it ſealed the promiſe of *Canaan* to thoſe that never went into *Canaan*, as many that died before that time, and afterwards many that were circumciſed died in the Wilderneſſe, and under Gods wrath, and ſo ſealed nothing at all,neither part of the Covenant viſibly,and that is hard, that ſo many there ſhould be neither the fulfilling of ſpiritual, nor temporal part of the promiſe.

3. Grant them this Covenant was mixt, then it was either in the ſubſtance, or circumſtances; if in the ſubſtance then *Abrahams* Covenant was not Goſpel, and believers muſt ſeek for another Father, as to the example of faith, and that were to make it rather like *Nebuchadnezzars* Image of Iron and Clay, than made up of Goſpel-materials; if in circum-

cumſtances of adminiſtration, and additaments of external types, it's granted, and we have the ſame promiſe now, with new outward adminiſtrations: if this mixture were in the nature and ſubſtance of the Covenant,then it muſt remain as long as the Covenant laſted, and ſo unto this day; for no man is ſo bold (though many are bold enough) as to ſay, that *Abrahams* Covenant is abrogated; if it be under any other conſideration, it's eaſily waved, and the truth the ſame. So that Circumciſion ſealed the Covenant primarily in its nature, as a Covenant of grace, and God being a God to circumciſe their hearts,*&c.* and *Canaan*, & other things conſequently and accidentally as God made a promiſe of them, for the better viſible adminiſtration of the Covenant to them in that external polity. And ſurely its beyond an ordinary reach to believe, that God ſhould make a Covenant with *Abraham*, and for his faith in it ſhould create him the Father of the faithfull in all ages, and this Covenant ſhould be brought in the N. T. and renewed, and the tenure of it freſhly held forth to believers there, and yet at the firſt making of it God ſhould mix temporal promiſes with the ſpiritual ſubſtance of it,and annex a ſeal that ſhould onely or ſpecially ſeal the temporal part of it, and ſo poorly confirm the main and eſſential nature of it, eſpecially when God ſpeaking of *Abrahams* faith, ſtiles Circumciſion the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of it, *Rom.*4. But of this more in another Chapter.

CHAP. III.

The distinction of Abrahams *seed into fleshly and spirituall, into naturall and believing, considered; whether the Infants of believers may not be called in the New Testament, the seed of* Abraham *?*

THE next thing which must have its place of consideration, is that question of *Abrahams* seed, with whom the promise was made; and upon this hinge hangs all the main weight on both sides; and if we make out Infants of believers in the N. T. to be in the Covenant, as *Abrahams* seed, the controversie would be at end: To make out this, the most of the following Chapters are designed; only in this we shall fall more directly on the question it self.

Those that differ from us make many distinctions of a fleshly carnal seed of *Abraham*, and of a spirituall seed, a believing and a natural seed, which distinctions are taken out of *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 23. and *Chap* 3. 16. and most true, if well applied; but before I come to open the *Scriptures*, *I* would premise these considerations concerning *Abraham* and his seed.

1. That

1. That *Abrahams* spirituall seed were as much his fleshly seed also, *Isaac* as *Ishmael*, except Proselytes and Servants.

2. The Covenant was administred to all *Abrahams* natural and fleshly Children, as if they had been spiritual, and before they knew what faith was, or could actually profess *Abrahams* faith.

3. It's no contradiction in different respects, to be a seed of the flesh by natural generation, and a Child under the same promise made with the Parent; for they both agreed in *Abrahams* case; none was a Child of promise, but as he came of *Abrahams* flesh: and as he came from *Abrahams* flesh, so every one had the seal of Gods Covenant on his flesh: Thus a spiritual promise was made with *Abraham* and his carnal seed

4. There was no distinction of *Abrahams* fleshly seed and his spiritual seed, in the Old Testament, but all comprehended under the same Covenant, untill they degenerated from *Abrahams* faith, and proved themselves to be meer carnal, and rejected the promise.

5. There is a carnall and spiritual seed of *Abraham*, even under the N. T. as our opposites must acknowledg, as well as Infants; so are the most visible Professors which they baptize: which may have no grace; and many prove carnal indeed, through the predominancy of their lusts and corruptions.

6. When there is mention of *Abrahams* carnall seed in opposition to spiritual seed, it cannot be

meant primarily or ſolely of thoſe that deſcended from *Abrahams* fleſh: for then *Iſaac* and *Jacob* were the carnall ſeed, yea, Chriſt himſelf, who as concerning the fleſh came of *Abraham*; it muſt be therefore of thoſe of *Abrahams* ſeed which degenerated, and ſlighted the Covenant of the Goſpel, and theſe were properly the carnal ſeed.

Surable to this is that diſtinction of *Abraham* being a natural and a ſpiritual Father: For,

Firſt, He was a natural Father to theſe to whom he was a ſpiritual Father as to *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, and the godly of their poſterity.

Secondly, All to whom he was a natural Father were under the Covenant, and had the ſeal, untill they reiected themſelves; the promiſe took in both relations, as to outward adminiſtration, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. 3. 4 And if we truely ſtate things, you may argue as much againſt *Abrahams* natural ſeed from enjoying theſe priviledges, as believers natural ſeed now, and with as much evidence of truth.

But let us weigh theſe Scriptures which are brought by our Oppoſites: Firſt, conſider that of *Rom.* 9. 6, 7 8. *They are not all* Iſrael *that are of* Iſrael; *neither becauſe they are the ſeed of* Abraham *are they all Children, but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*; *that is, they which are the Children of the fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God: but the Children of promiſe are accounted for the ſeed.*

The Apoſtle in this Chapter doth with a bleeding heart begin the ſad ſtory of the Jews rejection from being

being a Church, and ſpeaks as one loath to mention it, and therefore brings it in with a paſſionate and hearty Apology. v. 1, 2, 3. he was in heavineſſe, he could wiſh himſelf *ἀνάθεμα*, accurſed from Chriſt, for his brethren, his Kinſmen according to the fleſh, that is, for theſe that we call Jews according to the fleſh.

Q. But what needed all this trouble to have a carnal generation of men cut off? Why doth *Paul* take on ſo heavily?

Sol. In the 4, and 5, v. he tells you, *Who are Iſraelites, to whom pertains the adoption of glory, and the Covenant, and the giving of the Law, and the ſervice of God, and the promiſes, whoſe are the* Fathers, *of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came*: Here is a Catalogue of high priviledges which belonged to the Jews, which they were to be cut off from, which lay on *Pauls* heart, and was like to ſink him.

Obj. Well, might ſome ſay, v. 6 then the promiſe of God is in vain, if they be rejected unto whom the adoption and the promiſes belong.

Sol. The Apoſtle anticipates that Objection, Not as though the Word of God hath taken no effect; no, the promiſe is the ſame, and immutable; *but they are not all* Iſraell *which are of* Iſraell; neither becauſe they are the ſeed of *Abraham*, are they all Children, *&c.* This is the very natural coherence of theſe words; let us now uſe our judgements to diſtinguiſh and review the place, and we ſhall finde it a weapon whoſe edge is turned againſt theſe that count it their own.

1. The

1. The Apoſtle is ſadly troubled for his kinſmen after the fleſh, for their rejection; his reaſon is, becauſe of the Covenant, and the promiſes made to them, becauſe they were the natural ſeed of *Abraham*: which holds forth that the promiſes and the priviledge of the Covenant were made indefinitely to all the Iſraelites.

2. That it's a moſt ſad thing to be excluded from the outward and general adminiſtration of the Covenant. Why ſhould *Paul* thus break out in his affections, for the loſs of outward priviledges, if it were not ſuch a mercy to be under them?

3. The Apoſtle holds forth, that perſons may be under the outward adminiſtrations of the Covenant, and yet not get the efficacy of it; v. 6. *They are not all* Iſrael *that are of* Iſrael; the Covenant was made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, all that were of him: and yet all were not *Iſrael*, that is, partakers of the inward life and efficacy of the Covenant; the Apoſtle onely in theſe verſes endeavours to take off that Objection, that God had broke his Covenant by caſting away the Jews, and ſo diſtinguiſheth of theſe that were meerly of his fleſh, who had the outward adminiſtration, but not the inward fruit, and theſe which were elect in the promiſe, in Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*; the reſt he calls the Children of the fleſh, the former the Children of promiſe, v. 8. and ſo though they were under the outward diſpenſation of the Covenant, yet God was not mutable, nor his promiſe, though he rejected them, becauſe of their own

own degeneration; ſo that the ſumme of this place is,

1. That the Covenant was made in general with *Abrahams* ſeed, to all that came from him.

2. That in the adminiſtration of general and indefinite promiſes, there is a ſecret diſtinction, and a vein of election carried through the adminiſtration, that takes hold of ſome, not of others.

3. That none are the Children of promiſe, real Saints, but thoſe that have the true effects of the Covenant in their hearts.

4. That all children of Believers, though the promiſe viſibly belong to them, as to *Abraham* and his ſeed, yet may not follow their Parents faith, and ſo not be *Iſrael*, though of *Iſrael*.

But here is nothing at all to demonſtrate that Infants, becauſe Children of the fleſh, are not under the promiſe: but rather the contrary; for in Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*, ſaith God: now he was a Child of *Abrahams* fleſh, as well as thoſe that were caſt off, and yet a Child of promiſe; ſo God makes his Covenant indefinitely with Believers and their ſeed, and yet the efficacy of the Covenant may reach but ſome, an *Iſaac* or a *Jacob*, an elect veſſel, and yet the other under the outward adminiſtration, untill they manifeſt the contrary: But more of this from that, *Acts* 2. 38, 39.

I come now to that other place ſo much urged by them, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham *and his ſeed were the promiſes made; he ſaith not to ſeeds, as of many, but*

but of one which is Christ : Now by Christ here cannot be meant barely Christ personal: for then no believer should be accounted for the seed but onely Christ; it must be meant of Christ mystically, or Politically considered, as the visible Head of the Church; if to Christ mystical, then to all the Elect as in him, and so to Infants as well as grown persons, who make up that mystical body; but thus the promise is conveyed under ground as it were, none knows the vein of it: thus in the Old Testament flesh and flesh came from *Abraham*, the Covenant administred to them both by its seal, yet one flesh enjoying the spiritual blessings, the other rejected.

Take the promise to be made to Christ, the seed, as the Head of a visible Church, then still it speaks for us; for Infants of believers were never cast out of the visible Church they were once in; and the promise is made now to them with their Parents, as shall be hereafter proved at large: but if we look no farther back then the 14. v. of this Chapter, we shall receive some light to this: Its said in the 13. v. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, &c. that the blessing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles through Christ* : *Abrahams* blessing what was it, but the promises, and the fruits, and privileges of the promise and Covenant made to him and his seed? The same blessing is now come on the Gentiles, but through Christ, who took away all obstructions in the passage of the Covenant by his death: Now,

1 This

1. This blessing of *Abraham* was not personal, but to him and his seed.

2. This very blessing is come on Gentile believers, as on *Abraham*: therefore it must come on believers of the Gentiles, and their seed also: For,

3. It cannot be called *Abrahams* blessing, except it come on the Gentiles according to the substantial terms of *Abrahams* Covenant: Now this was the absolute form of *Abrahams* blessing, *I will be a God of thee and of thy seed*; and this very blessing is come on the Gentiles through Christ, as it came on *Abraham*; and therefore it must be to believing Gentiles, and their seed: else it will neither be *Abrahams* blessing in the form, nor fatness of it; *Abrahams* blessing will descend on the Gentiles clipt half off, not like it self: And it must needs be a very uncouth saying to all judicious ears, to say, that *Abrahams* blessing is come on the Gentiles by Christ, as it was on the Jews by *Abraham*, and exclude half the Subjects at once from any right to it; for so you must, if you cast out the seed of Gentile believers.

And to what end should the Apostle say, The blessing of *Abraham*, and not the promise or Covenant is come to the Gentiles, but that he intended it to the Gentile believers and their seed, as formerly it came to *Abraham* and his? This shall be further cleared from *Acts* 2. and *Rom* 11. in their order.

But in *Gal.* 3. 29. the Apostle (say they) describes who are the seed; *If you be Christs, then you are*

Abrahams

Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to promise:* So that now no Children born of believing Parents can be the seed; for they must be Christs, according to that in v. 26. *We are all the Children of God through faith in Christ Jesus.*

In general, not to omit that which *Beza* saith on the place, that *Claramontanus* Bible hath the words thus, and as he thinks more right εἰ δὲ εἷς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ, *If you be one in Christ, then ye are* Abrahams *seed:* This is suitable to the former verse, where he saith, *There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free,* &c. *but ye are all one in Christ Jesus; and if ye be all one, then* Abrahams *seed:* From which,

1. It's clear the Apostle is endeavouring to take away all difference between Jew and Gentile, and to hold forth their unity in Christ, where there is no distinction as formerly: but now the Gentiles being one in Christ, are *Abrahams* seed, as well as the natural and believing Jews.

1. The Apostle here hath no intent to shew the distinction of *Abrahams* seed as the subject of the outward priviledges, and administrations of Ordinances, but to shew that none are spiritually and really *Abrahams* seed, and heirs of promise, but such as are Christs, one in him with *Abraham*: For if this should be the distinction of seed as the subject of outward Ordinances, it would be as much against professing believers as Infants; for there is a carnal profession as well as a fleshly generation, the former more abominable.

The

The Proposition from this expression, as they draw it, is thus; None but these who are Christs are *Abrahams* seed, and none are Christs but real believers, and therefore none but they must be baptized.

Thus some say (though weakly) The spiritual seed and now the subject of Baptism, the new Creature, the man in Christ, Baptism knows no flesh. with many such like expressions from this and other places: But let us weigh things.

1. If none but such are *Abrahams* seed, and so none but such the subject of Baptism, then visible believers are not the subject of Baptism; for they may not be Christs, or new Creatures, no more than Infants; hardly one among twenty that are truly in Christ among the most glorious of them, and so not *Abrahams* seed.

2. None must be baptized at all upon this account; for who knows who is Christs according to election and saving faith?

If they say, We have charitable grounds to believe so of visible Professors, untill we see the contrary;

I answer, This is nothing to the Question, as it is stated, nor as it lies in the Text; the Text saith, *If ye be Christs, then ye are* Abrahams *seed:* You say none are in Christ but real believers, and yon must baptize none but a spiritual seed, and new Creatures, which will require not onely a judgement of charity, but infallibility to determine.

2. The

2. The Apoſtle is here deſcribing what the real ſeed and ſpiritual ſeed are, as having an inward right to Chriſt, and not what the apparent ſeed of *Abrahams* was: For,

1. Mark whom he ſpeaks unto; to grown perſons the *Galatians*, who were viſible Profeſſors and Believers.

2. He puts them to a trial of themſelves, whether they were Chriſts or no, after they had made a profeſſion; for they having legaliz'd, and returned to look after Jewiſh Ordinances and works, he tells them, their Ordinances were nothing, their priviledges nothing, being Jew or Greek, but as they were in Chriſt: The ſame he follows on, Chap. 6. 15 *In Chriſt neither circumciſion nor uncircumciſion availeth any thing, but a new Creature*: So that the Apoſtle here puts an [*If*] to the profeſſing *Galatians*, *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye* Abrahams *ſeed.*

3. If you have no more but the judgement of your charity to diſtinguiſh thus of men in Chriſt, reall Believers, and *Abrahams* ſeed, then we have the ſame ground of charity to act on Infants of believers: For,

1. They may be Chriſts as well as grown perſons.

2. God would have us account them holy, as we ſhall prove from that, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

3. Seeing they have been taken into the ſame Covenant.

4. *Seeing*

4. Seeing Chriſt ſhewed ſo much reſpect to Infants, when brought to him. To judge a viſible Profeſſor to be Chriſts, and *Abrahams* ſeed, I have nothing but the purblinde eye of my probable judgment. To judg a Believers Infant Chriſts, I have a general Scripture aſſertion, and the ground of an indefinite promiſe, which is more then all my conjectures: So that,

1. Viſible Profeſſors are not the ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*; for they may not be Chriſt's; therefore there is no ſpiritual ſeed but theſe that have ſaving faith, which all have not.

2. Infants of believers are as much the ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham* as viſible profeſſing believers, and we have as much ground to judge of the one as the other, untill they manifeſt the contrary; and our of judgment on them may have leſs deceit in it then there is in that we paſs on grown perſons

3. If you will diſtinguiſh of *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed & ſpiritual under the Goſpel, you cannot apply it to Infants, but to profeſſing believers; for the children of believers are not the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham*; but if there be any ſuch diſtinction, it muſt be between viſible grown Profeſſors, of whom ſome are ſpiritual, & Chriſt's; & others carnal, & born under Mount *Sinai*, and not Chriſts.

4. Its a true rule in Logick, that in every good diviſion, *Partes debent inter ſe opponi*, The Parts ought to be oppoſite: Now to be born from *Abraham* both as a natural & ſpiritual Father, was

both cõmon, through the promiſe in the old Teſtament, & not univerſally oppoſite; & ſo it may be now, an Infant is born of the fleſh of a believer yet the Covenant makes the believer a ſpiritual Father in ſome reſpects, as well as a natural.

5. The Seed takes its demonſtration from the Covenant, and its tenure; & if the Covenant be made to *Abraham* and his ſeed, and theſe were at firſt Infants of his body, and renewed with believers in the N. T. as we ſhall prove in the following Diſcourſe: then Infants of believers are the ſeed now as well as formerly, *Abraham* only being the firſt root and Father.

6. Viſibility of profeſſion doth no more make a man of the ſpiritual ſeed, and ſo Chriſt's now under the New Teſtament, then the Covenant in the outward adminiſtration in the Old, made all the Jews and their Children really new Creatures, and a ſpiritual ſeed; for under the one and the other, perſons may be carnal.

All theſe conſiderations are to ſhew that theſe places of Scripture are miſtaken, and do not ſhew who is the ſeed as to Ordinances, but who are the ſeed as to election & ſalvation; & that Infants may be as well the ſeed, notwithſtanding all theſe places, as well as viſible Profeſſors.

Q. If any ſay, But we have no warrant to judge of any but by viſible profeſſion.

Sol. Let us judge as God would have us, & we ſhall finde as much ground to paſs ſuch a judgment

ment on Infants as them; if God call them holy we may do ſo, and it will be dangerous then to call them uncleane.

2. The promiſe is the ſurer way of judging, ſeeing at beſt we can but judge externally, and with hopes; & it's better to rely on God, & to expect what he will do through his promiſe, at leaſt on ſome, then to truſt my own judgement.

3. The Word owns Infants of believers viſibly, as we own viſible Profeſſors, as the Scriptures following will demonſtrate.

For the preſent, ſeriouſly view all theſe places together, *Gen.* 17.7. *Acts* 2.38,39. *Deut.* 30.6. 11, 12,13,14. *Rom.* 10. 1. 6,7,8. with *Heb.* 8.10,11. *Jer.* 31. 22. *Eſay.* 65.23. with many ſuch places, that hold forth the ſeed to Infants as well in the New Teſtament as in the Old.

I end this chapter with this conſideration, that if you exclude Infants of believers to be *Abrahams* ſeed, upon this ground, becauſe they are not the ſpiritual ſeed: then daſh out the name as well of grown Profeſſors to be *Abrahams* ſeed, who are no more ſo really becauſe of that, then theſe Infants, and we ſhall quit the one with the other, & then there ſhall be found no viſible ſubjects of Baptiſm either of infants or grown perſons: for they are both, as to election & inward grace, unknown to us to be *Abrahams* ſeed; they were both formerly accounted *Abrahams* ſeed, grown perſons, *and infants eſpecially by the Covenant*;

and now the one is to be accounted *Abrahams* seed, *viz.* grown persons professing; though they may have no right to the inward grace of the Covenant; and Infants who had first right next to *Abraham*, must be excluded, though they have never so real an interest, because they are Infants, and cannot speak for themselves: But so much of this; the next Chapter will second this.

CHAP. IV.

How any person may be said to be in the Covenant; the divers considerations about it.

TO the former let this be added, because it seems strange how any can be in Covenant, & yet not partake of salvation: In opening of this, the common distinctions of all Divines must be repeated, that according as there is an internal and external administration of the Covenant, so there is a twofold being in the Covenant.

1. *Secundùm propositum electionis*, According to the purpose of election in Gods heart, and his eternal decree; so only the elect, and these which have saving faith, are in Covenant: this some call and not improperly, to be intentionally in Covenant; God principally intending the Covenant to them; others call it spiritually and savingly from the effect.

2. There is a being in Covenant *in facie visibilis Ecclesiæ*,

Ecclesiæ, In the face, or according to the judgment of a visible Church, where judgment and charity are mixt together, *Rom* 9.4. *Deut.*29.10,12,13, 14. *Job.*15.2. *Job.*1.11, *Psal.*50.5. with variety of Scripture: And of such there are two sorts.

1. Such as stand by their own visible profession; as all first Covenanters do, so all visible Sts. now, & so many Proselytes in the Old Testament, *Exod.* 12.44,45. *Deut.*29.10,11. *Gen.*12.5. Or else, 2. As in a Political Moral consideration, as in the right of another through a free promise; as if a Prince give a title of Honor, or a piece of land to one & his heirs, they are all interested in it, yet some prove fools, or traitors, and are afterwards incapable: Its so in this, and was with *Abraham* and his seed: Now that this distinction holds in the New Testament, I shall thus discover to you.

1. If men deny an external, as well as internal being in Covenant, none can administer an external Ordinance, an outward sign to any; for we must go by external rules in these actings.

2. Visible Professors will have the worst of it; for we must administer no Ordinance to these which are not internally in Covenant; and we have no proof but their own expressions, and our good hopes, and present probable judgment to warrant us, & many visible miscarriages to contradict our judgments & hopes at special times.

3. We set a seal to a blank to all grown persons, who are baptized, or receive the Lords Sup-

per, without we know them certainly in the covenant; and that who knows? for our judgement will no more hinder the seal from being a blank to grown Professors then to Infants, without they prove real at last.

4. The best evidence you can have from any of their being in Covenant, is but visible expressions, suppositions, and hopes, and probabilities, all which you must help out by your own charity, and fallible observation; for God hath promised no seal on my spirit for another mans condition; it's a blessed mercy if I get the seal on my own heart for my self.

So that the great Question will be answered from this, which Mr. *Tombes* and they all urge, That if God made the Covenant with believers, and their seed, they must all be saved, &c. With which I shall but thus parly.

1. Doth God make the Covenant of salvation with every visible Professor whom they baptize? or with every visible Saint? or do they baptize them out of Covenant? Then how come any to fall off, and be damned? or what rule have they to baptize by?

2. Why should it be thought more hainous to set a seal on Infants, as in the Covenant, then on these Professors which afterwards prove not to be in Covenant?

3. Or do they baptize, because that persons are in the Covenant? If not, then upon no spiritual account

count; if upon their being in Covenant, then either internally or externally; on the first it cannot be absolutely, but as manifested externally; not upon a meer external being in Covenant; for then they may set a seal to a blank: if upon both together, the one externally demonstrated by the other, then it is still by the external being in Covenant that we judg with hopes of the other. There is a trick that some have got, whereby they think to evade this being in Covenant, as the fundamental ground of Baptism, by this distinction; That it is not being in Covenant, but being an actual *Believer*, gives right: *To which I answer.*

1. That the Covenant, take it spiritually, is the ground of faith, not faith of the Covenant.

2. If the Covenant be the ground of faith (for who can believe without a promise?) it may well be the ground of an outward priviledge.

3. To separate the Covenant from the conveyance of actual priviledges, is almost as dangerous as to separate actual faith from the Covenant; for the one gives a right as well as the other.

4. Infants in the Old Testament were thus as really to be esteemed in the Covenant, as actual visible Believers are now; and under the external administration of the Covenant, as the Proselytes who came in to the Jewish Church, and were the first fruits of the Gentiles.

For that there is an external administration of the Covenant of *Abraham*, or Father of God in

Christ, even in the New Testament, is clear; for that many were baptized who proved hypocrites and many believed visibly likewise, as *Simon Magus Hymenæus, Alexander, Philetus, &c.* many in all the Churches; and yet these must be accounted the spiritual seed, though most wicked, because they can professe their own present sudden faith: and poor Infants of believers must be accounted the carnal seed, though so long under a Gospel promise; of which you shal not want proof hereafter

Now that all which are baptized, or have any Ordinance, have it administred fundamently on the ground of the Covenant externally administred, I prove thus.

1. God administers all his graces by Covenant, much more outward Ordinances.

2. Souls can have no challenge or interest in God, but by some Covenant or other; God is tied to none, but as he ties himself.

3. If there were not a visible and external administration of the Covenant, none should know of the invisible designe of it unto any: all things would be in the dark to us, as to Gods Covenant in a visible dispensation.

4. If this invisible design were not secretly carried on in an outward visible dispensation, there could be none condemned by an outward rule: for who can condemn these who are intentionally, and invisibly in Covenant, or for *Re?* And if every one visibly in Covenant be intentionally

onally and spiritually in Covenant, its just the same.

The whole is this; None are in Covenant (say they) but real believers, the spiritual seed, so none to be baptized but such: when it comes to application of the Ordinance, then none are the spiritual seed but visible believers; and these visible believers can be judged by no way but by an external profession to be in Covenant; and Infants are no visible believers, therefore no spiritual seed; when as the one is as visible by promise, as the other by profession.

CHAP. V.

Opening that place in Acts 2.39.

Ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν.

THis Text I first hold forth as fit to discover the New Testament application of the Covenant of grace, and its continuation to believers and their seed, as to *Abraham* and his in the Old Testament: It is the first Argument used after Christs ascension, to provoke the Jews to repent, and submit to Gospel ordinances; and the first open promulgation of the Covenant both to Jew and Gentile, with the prime priviledges of it; in which is contained the Gospel Covenant made with believers and their seed.

1. Here is (*ἡ ἐπαγγελία*) the promise; which

can

can be no other then the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins,& ſo of ſalvation;ſutable to that in *Gen.*17.7 and repeated at large in *Jer.*31.34. For it muſt either be a promiſe of temporal things, or ſpiritual;of temporal things it cannot be; for there is no abſolute promiſe of theſe things in the New Teſtament,but as included in, or following ſpiritual mercies, as *Mat.*6.33. Neither is there a ſyllable in this Chapter preſſing men to look after temporal enjoyments,or engaging them to embrace the Goſpel by any outward emolluments.

Ob. The great and only interpretation of this promiſe by theſe that differ, is, that it hath reference to v. 16. and is meant of the promiſe of the holy Ghoſt propheſied of by *Joel Chap.*2.28. which was to be poured forth in the latter daies, and now viſibly and eminently begun to be fulfilled at the day of Pentecoſt.

To which the Anſwer will be clear and fair, though that be granted; and not at all weaken, but ſtrengthen the former ſenſe: For,

1. That promiſe is a ſpiritual promiſe,& more large & comprehenſive of ſpiritual mercies then any other;the promiſe of the ſpirit is as much as to promiſe all at once,graces,gifts,yea Heaven it ſelf,for all are but the fruits of this promiſe;Chriſt in the Old Teſtament,and the Spirit in the New, contain all the promiſes in an eminency. When Jeſus Chriſt was to leave the World,and ſpeak all his heart at once,& leave his laſt bleſſing, that ſhould be

be better then his bodily preſence among them, he expreſſes all in this,that he would ſend the Spirit *Joh.*14.16,26.*Ch.*15.26,16.7. And of this large promiſe, as well according to Chriſt's promiſe before his Aſcenſion,as *Joels* Propheſie,the Apoſtles and Believers received the firſt fruits in this ſolemn day of Chriſts triumph: So that to ſay it's the promiſe of the Spirit,is as much as to ſay it's the promiſe of all ſpiritual things: For this read in *Gal.*3.14. the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the fruits of Chriſts death, ſaith, *It was that the bleſſing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles through Jeſus Chriſt, that we might receive the promiſe of the* Spirit *through faith*; The ſame phraſe that is in this 38. *And in the promiſe of the ſpirit, which is to be received by faith is included juſtification, ſanctification; yea all graces, and its here joyned with the bleſſing of* Abraham: But,

2. If they take the promiſe of the Spirit in a limited and reſtrictive ſenſe, for the external gifts, as the moſt do,for the gifts of tongues, and miracles, and propheſie, they both clip the promiſe and make the argument & comfort from it invalid. and of no efficacy.

1. It's a mighty wrong to that famous promiſe of the Spirit, to circumſcribe it in theſe accidental gifts which were eſpecially neceſſary, and almoſt onely for that ſeaſon: when it's a promiſe that reacheth all the latter dayes, and is ſtill accompliſhing

compliſhing, though all theſe extraordinary gifts are ceaſed.

2. This ſtraitned ſenſe is expunged by the manner of the expreſſions of that Propheſie, both in *Joel*, & this in the *Acts*, *I will pour out of my ſpirit on all fleſh, and on your ſervants and handmaids will I pour out of my ſpirit*: Which ſhews the univerſality and variety of the ſubjects, and bleſſings in this promiſe, that it ſhall be ſo large and full a mercy; as if there were to be no limitation of its meaſure.

3. If it were meant meerly of theſe gifts, why then there is no more benefit of that promiſe after the Apoſtles days, but that Chriſt was out of date, and did expire with that age: whereas it is a promiſe made for all the time of the New Teſtament, which is expreſt by the latter days, and the laſt days, up and down the Scripture.

A parallel promiſe to this you have in *Iſa.* 44.3 *I will pour water on him that is thirſty, and floods on the dry ground; I will pour my ſpirit on thy ſeed, and my bleſſing on thy off ſpring*: Now the promiſe of the ſpirit is alwayes appropriated to the New Teſtament days.

And ſecondly, This cannot be the meaning of this phraſe, if we conſider to whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *to perſons pricked in their hearts, wounded for their ſins in crucifying of Jeſus Chriſt, crying out*, v. 37. *Men and Brethren, what ſhall we do to be ſaved?* Now what comfort could this be to tell them they ſhould

ſhould have extraordinary gifts? their hearts were bleeding under ſin, their eye was on ſalvation, they ſaw no hopes of it, nor knew the way to obtain it; the Apoſtle bids them *repent and be baptized*; they might have ſaid, What ſhall we be the better? why (ſaith the Apoſtle) *You ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt; for the promiſe is unto you:* What promiſe? of gifts, of tongues and miracles: What is this to our ſouls? how will this ſave us? might they well object. It would be but a poor comfort to a wounded ſoul for to tell him of a promiſe of gifts, not of ſpiritual grace; and the holy Ghoſt is a better Phyſician than to apply ſuch a raw improper plaiſter to a wounded heart, which would hardly heal the skin: this promiſe is brought in as a cordial, to keep them from fainting, and to give them ſpirits to believe and lay hold on Jeſus Chriſt: And truly no other promiſe but that of free grace, in order to ſalvation, can be imagined to give them comfort in that condition.

But to put all out of queſtion, That the promiſe propheſied of in *Joel*, and quoted here, was the promiſe of ſalvation, and the ſame with the Covenant of Grace, Conſult the Original in *Joel* and the parallel in this of the *Acts*; in *Joel* 2.27. the Prophet founds all the promiſes that went before, and all that come after, on this, *That he is the Lord their God, and none elſe*; which was the very expreſſe words in that Covenant made with *Abraham*:

compliſhing, though all theſe extraordinary gifts are ceaſed.

2. This ſtraitned ſenſe is expunged by the manner of the expreſſions of that Propheſie, both in *Joel*, & this in the *Acts*, *I will pour out of my ſpirit on all fleſh, and on your ſervants and handmaids will I pour out of my ſpirit*: Which ſhews the univerſality and variety of the ſubjects, and bleſſings in this promiſe, that it ſhall be ſo large and full a mercy; as if there were to be no limitation of its meaſure.

3. If it were meant meerly of theſe gifts, why then there is no more benefit of that promiſe after the Apoſtles days, but that Chriſt was out of date, and did expire with that age: whereas it is a promiſe made for all the time of the New Teſtament, which is expreſt by the latter days, and the laſt days, up and down the Scripture.

A parallel promiſe to this you have in *Iſa.* 44.3 *I will pour water on him that is thirſty, and floods on the dry ground; I will pour my ſpirit on thy ſeed, and my bleſſing on thy off ſpring*: Now the promiſe of the ſpirit is alwayes appropriated to the New Teſtament days.

And ſecondly, This cannot be the meaning of this phraſe, if we conſider to whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *to perſons pricked in their hearts, wounded for their ſins in crucifying of Jeſus Chriſt, crying out*, v. 37. *Men and Brethren, what ſhall we do to be ſaved?* Now what comfort could this be to tell them they ſhould

ſhould have extraordinary gifts? their hearts were bleeding under ſin, their eye was on ſalvation, they ſaw no hopes of it, nor knew the way to obtain it; the Apoſtle bids them *repent and be baptized*; they might have ſaid, What ſhall we be the better? why (ſaith the Apoſtle) *You ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt; for the promiſe is unto you*: What promiſe? of gifts, of tongues and miracles: What is this to our ſouls? how will this ſave us? might they well object. It would be but a poor comfort to a wounded ſoul for to tell him of a promiſe of gifts, not of ſpiritual grace; and the holy Ghoſt is a better Phyſician than to apply ſuch a raw improper plaiſter to a wounded heart, which would hardly heal the skin: this promiſe is brought in as a cordial, to keep them from fainting, and to give them ſpirits to believe and lay hold on Jeſus Chriſt: And truly no other promiſe but that of free grace, in order to ſalvation, can be imagined to give them comfort in that condition.

But to put all out of queſtion, That the promiſe propheſied of in *Joel*, and quoted here, was the promiſe of ſalvation, and the ſame with the Covenant of Grace, Conſult the Original in *Joel* and the parallel in this of the *Acts*; in *Joel* 2.27. the Prophet founds all the promiſes that went before, and all that come after, on this, *That he is the Lord their God, and none elſe*; which was the very expreſſe words in that Covenant made with *Abraham*:

Abraham: And then afterwards, *viz.* in the New Testament, to make out this fully, *He will pour out his spirit on all flesh, &c.* v.32. which is a part of that prophesie, and is quoted again in v.21. *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved*; one grace put for all; and salvation being put at the end of the promise, must needs be the aim of it. The same expression you have again repeated, *Rom.*10.13.

And in the former v.38. he exhorts them to repent, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *for the remission of sin*; the exhortation is to a Gospel duty; the effect and profit of it was to be remission of sins, and receiving the gift of the holy Ghost; and the promise must needs be answerable, by which all is enforced & it must needs have been a mighty low & disproportionable way of perswasion, to put them upon such high things in the former verse, & to encourage them only by the narration of a promise of some temporary gifts in the following, when their eye and heart was set on remission of sins, and salvation by Jesus Christ; and nothing but a promise holding forth these mercies could have been considerable to them,

And it's very observable, in that verse he joyns remission of sins with the gift of the holy Ghost; and then adds the promise to both, as the ground of one and the other, and comprehending both: And for that expression of *Receiving the gift of the holy Ghost*, it may well be noted, that it is λήψεως

δώρεαν, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου, *the free gift*; not τὰ χαρίσματα, *the gifts of the holy spirit*; noting the very sending of the spirit as a free gift to bestow all mercies on them; and so respecting rather the free & bounteous manner of bestowing the holy Ghost on them, then any limited effects of his reception.

By all which it is demonstrated, that this is no ordinary, common, no temporal promise, or of meer gifts, though never so extraordinary, but a promise of free grace.

I onely add this to all the rest, as undeniable by the principles of these that differ; it's a promise made not only to these Jews, but it's universally to the Gentiles, and to all the called of God: but all that are called have not received such gifts of the holy Ghost which then were given; but every one that is effectually called doth receive the promise of remission of sins, and the free favour of God, and therefore this promise must be taken mainly in that sense.

But the great difficulty is in the following part of the verse, and about the interest of their Children in this promise, and therefore the next work must be to make out this, that the children as well as the Parents are included in this promise, as they were in the promise made with *Abraham*.

1. Let us consider to whom the Apostle speaks to the Jews, who were prickt in their hearts; *The promise is to you and your Children*; He speaks to them

them after the wonted manner of expreſſion in the Old Teſtament, when ever the promiſe is mentioned; and uſeth their own language in which they were trained up in from their Fathers; *I will be the God of thee and thy ſeed*, Gen. 17. *The promiſe is to you and your Children*: If the Apoſtle had intended to exclude their children from the ſame priviledges they had formerly by the Covenant, he would never have ſpoken in ſuch a known dialect of the Old Teſtament: and to Jews, who could take it in no other ſenſe but this, that the promiſe ſhall run as formerly, to them and their ſeed.

2. Let us mind on what ground this is brought in, *viz.* as an argument and ſtrong inducement of them to repent and be baptized, as in the former verſe; *for the promiſe is to you and your ſeed*: He encourageth them from this to receive the Ordinance of baptiſm themſelves, for the promiſe was ſtill the ſame to them & their Children; only now they muſt firſt believe & be baptized themſelves, ere their children could be conſidred in the promiſe: If the Apoſtle had not intended to hold forth to them now believing and being baptized, and their Children, the ſame priviledges they had before as to the promiſe, it would have been the greateſt deluſion inſtead of an argument to perſwade them to be baptized on this ground, becauſe the promiſe was to them and their Children; they had been rather deceived by it, then enlightned

enlightened; and ſtumbled by ſuch a propoſition more then informed of a New Teſtament adminiſtration.

3 Upon what hinge can this Exhortation turn? where is the vertue and ſtrength it hath to move them to be baptized themſelves, but on this conſideration, that they ſhould not only enjoy bleſſings themſelves, through the promiſe, but their Children with them? The promiſe to them was enough for themſelves to ſubmit to that Ordinance: but the height of the enforcement is from the riches of the promiſe, that it was not only to them, but their Children; they might bleſs themſelves & theirs by ſubmitting to the Goſpel; elſe to put in the name of their Children ſpeaking to the Jews, was but to lay a temptation before them, & rather to puzzle them then encourage them: & doubtleſs the Holy Ghoſt would never in the firſt opening of the Goſpel, & encouraging ſouls to embrace it, uſe ſuch a language & expreſſion that might deceive thoſe he ſpake unto: for what could the Jews imagine & conceive upon ſuch a diſcovery, but that if they themſelves did repent and were baptized, the promiſe ſhould be the ſame in the N.T. to them and their Children, as it was formerly to *Abraham*, upon his believing and being circumciſed; to him and his ſeed? there being no expreſſion the Jews were ſo accuſtomed to, & more delighted in, then that of the promiſe to them & their Children: And but to mention their Children with the promiſe,

if it was not meant to hold forth that they were ſtill in the promiſe, was ſufficient to have deceived them, who were never inſtructed in any other method: The great deſign of the Apoſtle was to open the N.T. promiſe, & by that to encourage the poor wounded Jews to repent & be baptized: and that they might have no cloud on their apprehenſions, or diſcouragement, he utters it in *lingua vernacula*, in the phraſe the promiſe was alwayes expreſt in the Old Teſtament.

4. If the intent of the Apoſtle were not to hold forth the ſameneſs & identity of the priviledge of the promiſe to the Jews & Gentiles now believing, as was formerly; he would never have mentioned Children when he mentions Baptiſm, & eſpecially not in the ſame line with the promiſe made to the Parents; & with one breath expreſs the promiſe to both, & make that the ſtrength of his argument to put them on the practice of that Ordinance: And doubtles it had not bin ſo candid away, nor ſutable to the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, to tel them of their Children, juſt when he tels them of being baptized themſelves; & name them immediatly with the promiſe, if the deſign was utterly to exclude them both from the promiſe & Baptiſm. I have been the longer inculcating theſe conſidrations, becauſe there is much in them, & engaged perſons can ſlightly paſs over the moſt eminent places with a meer glance.

Ob. But it's objected, That the latter clauſe, (ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται κύριος) *As many as the* Lord *ſhall*

ſhall call, is a limitation of the verſe, & no more are under the promiſe; and ſo Children, if God ſhall call them, ſhall alſo enjoy the promiſe.

Sol. For anſwer to this laſt objection, which is the ſtrength of their confidence from this place, we muſt conſider theſe particulars.

1. That in this verſe you have an exact diſtribution of the world into Jew and Gentile, according to the uſual diſtribution in other Scriptures; the Gentiles being uſually called theſe *afar off*; and the promiſe equally diſtributed among; onely he adds (*as many as the Lord ſhall call*) to theſe which are afar, as moſt proper in that place: but it can in no ſenſe be referred to the former part of the verſe, either to Parents or children: For,

1. He changes the tenſe in both parts of the verſ in the firſt part unto the Jews, he ſpeaks *de præſenti*, of the preſent application of the promiſe; *Repent you, and be baptized——for the promiſe is to you and your Children*; even now the promiſe is offered to you & they were then under the call of God: But when he ſpeaks of the Gentiles, becauſe they were yet afar off & not at all called, he ſpeaks *de futuro*, as many as God ſhall call, even of them alſo; which is the firſt expreſs hint of the calling of the Gentiles in all the Acts of the Apoſtles.

2. How unequal would the diſtribution be of this verſe, not ſutable to the laws of expreſſion among rational men? If *As many as the Lord ſhall call* ſhould be a limitation to the former part of the verſe,

the word *Children*, muſt needs be redundant and ſuperfluous; for Jews and Gentiles comprehend all the world. Now Children muſt either be one part of the world, or comprehended under one or both names, or be a diſtinct world by themſelves, neither Jews nor Gentiles: And this muſt needs follow on ſuch a reading of the words; for the deſign of the Apoſtle is to hold forth the freeneſs of the promiſe to Jew and Gentile, & their Children; to theſe Jews at preſent, to the Gentiles and their Children when God ſhould call the Parents, as he did theſe Jews. Now put Children by themſelves, as a third party, and add *whom the Lord ſhall call*, & you exclude them from being either Jews or Gentiles, & ſo excommunicate them from any hopes of calling or being ſaved: Now this is,

1. Contrary to that known rule in Logick, That *Omnis bona diſtributio debet eſſe bimembris*; only of two members, and theſe oppoſite one to another; to bring in a third mars all. So that it is moſt clear, the words muſt be underſtood, as they are tranſlated; The promiſe is to you Jewes, and your Children at preſent, and to thoſe afar off alſo, and their Children, when God ſhall *call them*, elſe *calling* can with no ſenſe be applied to any tittle of the former part of the verſe, without you make it monſtrous, and unlike it ſelf.

2. It's againſt another rule about diſtribution, which is, That *Partes diviſionis ambulent æquali paſſu*, That the parts of a diſtribution ſhould be equally ſet

ſet together. Now here will be a mighty inequality, as to the communication of the promiſe; if the words ſhould be taken in their ſenſe, the Jews will have a greater priviledge then the Gentiles, if Children be not equally added to both; the Jews had the promiſe made to them and their Children at preſent; theſe afar off ſhall only have the promiſe to themſelves, but not their Children.

3. Conſider how comes this word (*your Children*) to be kept in, for what end and uſe, if it were not to ſhew ſome ſpecial priviledge they have with their Parents, when God cals or converts the Parents? what ſtands it for but a ſtone of offence to conſcientious hearts?

OBJECTION.

All they anſwer to this, is, that the Apoſtle names their Children to comfort their parents, becauſe they had wiſhed Chriſts blood on their Children, and ſo to give them hopes they might yet be ſaved, if God ſhould call them.

SOLUTION.

To ſee the ſaid ſhifts of errour, is wonderfull: Can any man imagine, that the Parents could doubt more, or ſo much of their Childrens being accepted & ſaved, when God ſhould call them who were innocent, & only under the ſudden raſh curſe of their Parents, when they ſaw that the promiſe was to themſelves, & Chriſt offered pardon to themſelves, who were the actuall murtherers of the Lord Jeſus.

the word *Children*, muſt needs be redundant and ſuperfluous; for Jews and Gentiles comprehend all the world. Now Children muſt either be one part of the world, or comprehended under one or both names, or be a diſtinct world by themſelves, neither Jews nor Gentiles: And this muſt needs follow on ſuch a reading of the words; for the deſign of the Apoſtle is to hold forth the freeneſs of the promiſe to Jew and Gentile, & their Children; to theſe Jews at preſent, to the Gentiles and their Children when God ſhould call the Parents, as he did theſe Jews. Now put Children by themſelves, as a third party, and add *whom the Lord ſhall call*, & you exclude them from being either Jews or Gentiles, & ſo excommunicate them from any hopes of calling or being ſaved: Now this is,

1. Contrary to that known rule in Logick, That *Omnis bona diſtributio debet eſſe bimembris*; only of two members, and theſe oppoſite one to another; to bring in a third mars all. So that it is moſt clear, the words muſt be underſtood, as they are tranſlated; The promiſe is to you Jewes, and your Children at preſent, and to thoſe afar off alſo, and their Children, when God ſhall *call them*, elſe *calling* can with no ſenſe be applied to any little of the former part of the verſe, without you make it monſtrous, and unlike it ſelf.

2. It's againſt another rule about diſtribution, which is, That *Partes diviſionis ambulent æquali paſſu*, That the parts of a diſtribution ſhould be equally

ſet together. Now here will be a mighty inequality, as to the communication of the promiſe; if the words ſhould be taken in their ſenſe, the Jews will have a greater priviledge then the Gentiles, if Children be not equally added to both; the Jews had the promiſe made to them and their Children at preſent; theſe afar off ſhall only have the promiſe to themſelves, but not their Children.

3. Conſider how comes this word (*your Children*) to be kept in, for what end and uſe, if it were not to ſhew ſome ſpecial priviledge they have with their Parents, when God calls or converts the Parents? what ſtands it for but a ſtone of offence to conſcientious hearts?

OBJECTION.

All they anſwer to this, is, that the Apoſtle names their Children to comfort their parents, becauſe they had wiſhed Chriſts blood on their Children, and ſo to give them hopes they might yet be ſaved, if God ſhould call them.

SOLUTION.

To ſee the ſaid ſhifts of errour, is wonderfull: Can any man imagine, that the Parents could doubt more, or ſo much of their Children being accepted & ſaved, when God ſhould call them who were innocent, & only under the ſudden raſh curſe of their Parents, when they ſaw that the promiſe was to themſelves, & Chriſt offered pardon to themſelves, who were the actuall murtherers of the Lord Jeſus.

2. Such a conſideration would, rather ſadden them then refreſh them, to mention the calling of their Children: For they might more doubt of that then of any thing, whether God would call them or no, & be as far to ſeek as ever they were that they would have but cold comfort upon this account; this was enough to break their hearts if that were in their eye; the old way of conveying the promiſe is cut off, no promiſe but to *called* ones; our poor Children are uncalled, & God knows whether ever they may be called of God: Thus might they reaſon. But when he includes them in the ſame promiſe with Parents, & exhorts the Parents to repent, upon this ground, that the promiſe is to them & their Children; this ſavours like a Goſpel comforting-exhortation, and could not be but of great efficacy upon their ſpirits.

4. What ſtrange myſterious tautologies would be in this one verſe? if that laſt ſentence ſhould refer to all the former *expreſſions*, we muſt read it thus; to make out their ſenſe.

The promiſe is to you Parents of the Jews, when God ſhall call you (and they were then under the call) and to you grown Children, when God ſhall call them; and to all which are afar off, when God ſhall call them: Can any man with his underſtanding about him think the Holy Ghoſt ſhould faulter ſo much in common expreſſion of his mind, when there was no need of adding or calling to any part, but to theſe that were afar off, who

who were never yet under Gods Goſpel call?

Laſtly, the word, Children, may and muſt be underſtood of Little Ones, Infants, not of adult and grown perſons, for theſe reaſons,

1. The word here (τεκνοῖς) properly ſignifies an off-ſpring, any thing brought forth, though it be but of a day, of a moment old: Thus when a woman is ſaid to be in pain, and to bring forth, this word is uſed, *John* 16.21. *Luke* 1.31. *Mat.* 1. 26. *Luke* 1.57.

2. It's an indefinite word, and therefore may not be reſtrained to grown Children, except God had expreſt it in a peculiar phraſe.

3. It muſt needs be eſpecially meant of Little Ones becauſe they are diſtinguiſhed from themſelves, who were men of years. Now when we diſtinguiſh between Men & Children, we ſuppoſe the one adult, the other under age, & not grown up; & it is contrary to all ways of expreſſion to think otherwiſe.

4. It cannot be rationally conjectured otherwiſe, becauſe the Apoſtle doth joyn them with their Parents in the ſame promiſe, and not leave them to ſtand by themſelves, as grown perſons muſt.

So that all things weighed, this Text of Scripture, if there were no more, holds forth the ſameneſs of the promiſe to Believers of the Goſpel, both Jew and Gentile, and their Children, as ever it was to *Abraham*, and his natural ſeed.

Chap. VI.

Their great plea from Mat. 3.8.9. *concerning* John *the Baptist's Speeches to the Pharisees and Sadducees, made vain, and that Text cleared from mistakes.*

THAT we may still take of the main Objections, let us view that place so much stood on, *Mat 3.7-8,9. When Iohn saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he saith, O generation of Vipers, who hath forewarned you to flee from the wrath to come? bring forth fruits meet for repentance: And think not to say within your selves we have* Abraham *to our Father; for I say that God is able of these stones to raise up Children to* Abraham: Upon this Text they gather, that the pretence of being *Abrahams* Children could not give them a right to Baptism; and if *John* denied *Abraham* natural seed on that account, much more would he the adopted Children.

But this is no such ominous place against Infant Baptism, Consider,

1. Who they were he speaks unto, the Pharisees and Sadducees, men at age, and degenerated from *Abrahams* faith, persons that live on their own works and righteousness; therefore he calls them γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, *A generation of Vipers*; which was not as they were *Abrahams* Children, but as they had not walked in *Abrahams* steps, but were quite

quite degenerated: Thus he did not refuse them because *Abraham* was their Father, or upon that account that *Abraham* seed had not right to the promise; but as only pretending *Abraham* to be their Father, when they walkt contrary to the principles of *Abrahams* faith.

2. That is the same now as to grown visible professors, who have related their faith to the Church, and so are baptized upon that account of faith, & repentance: yet if afterwards they grow carnal & apostate, and if such should come to receive the Lords Supper, and challenge it because they are baptized, we might say the same as *John* to the Pharisees & Sadducees: Do not think to say that you are baptised, or that you have had godly Parents; for you are a generation of Vipers, you have cut off your own right by contrary actings in your own persons; & yet it doth nothing at all impeach the truth of this position. That Believers and their Infants are in Covenant, & ought to be judged so until they manifest the contrary; or that if they believed themselves afterward, the promise shou'd not be unto them & their Children: And that Text holds not no more then this, That when persons are grown up to years, & come to understanding, they must then stand on their right & look to make out personal qualifications of new Ordinances.

3. This was at the first institution of the Ordinance, when Baptism was newly administred: Now new institutions (as before) require grown persons

sons, and actuall visible believers to be the first subject of them; they could not baptize their Children first, for then the Parents would be neglected; & the bringing in of a new Ordinance requires renewing of special acts in these which partake first of it; as if an old *Lease* which is made in the name of a man & his Children, be at such a season to be renewed upon some certain terms, the man himself must come, & acknowledge his owning these terms, & then it is to him & his, as before: So now in the New Testament God renews the Covenant of *Abraham*, adds a new initiating seal to it; it was before entail'd in such a line, which is cut off; it's now of the same nature, only every one must come in his own person first, as *Abraham*, and enter his own name, & then the promise is to him & his seed: Thus it was in the former place, where when the Jews came to be baptized, they were exhorted first to repent and be baptized themselves; then the *promise is to you and your Children*: So that this we affirm,

1. That no man must be baptized, or receive an Ordinance by any fleshly prerogative; but where there is an entail of a promise, there is a spiritual ground of administration.

2. That no person grown up to years of understanding, hath right to a sealing Ordinance, but upon his own personal qualifications.

3. That persons may have present capacities, & visible right to Ordinances, and yet afterwards cut off

off themselves, and be found incapable, as *Ishmael* and here the Pharisees and Sadducees.

4. That the exception of some persons upon the account of their degeneration, & personal defects, doth not hinder, but the old priviledge of the promise may be conveyed to these which do really embrace the Gospel, and to their seed; all these are undeniable in themselves: And this Text reacheth no further then to the exclusion of these which had demonstrated themselves to be only the Children of the flesh, & not of the promise also: which is a demonstration only *à posteriori*, from their after actings: & teacheth us that these that boast in outward priviledges, without looking after personal qualifications, & holy frames within, may be as well judged carnal, as Heathens & prophane persons.

CHAP. VII.

That special place in 1 Cor. 7. 14. *opened, and argument*; Else were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.

THIS place of Scripture, though it seems to stand by it self, yet hath full correspondence and harmony with all other places in the N. T. concerning this truth. As the former did hold forth the promise, the Covenant to Believers and their Children, in distinction from all the world: so doth this leave a character of special qualifications suitable to a subject of such an Ordinance,

and

and when the promiſe and the qualification ſhall meet together, there is enough for to capacitate to any Ordinance.

The Apoſtle is in this verſe anſwering a ſcruple which might ariſe in the hearts of the *Corinthians* concerning abiding together of married perſons; the one being a Convert, and a Believer; the other, whether man or woman, an Unbeliever; as it was a common caſe in the Apoſtles times, the Husband might be converted, the Wife not; and the Wife converted, and not the Husband; the Word working on the one, not on the other; this begat a doubt in the believing Party, whether he or ſhe might with a good conſcience live together in that ſtate.

The Apoſtle anſwers it, ver. 12,13. poſitively That they ought not to ſeparate, or leave each other, notwithſtanding that the one was an Unbeliever: And he gives in this ver. 14. a ſtrong and peculiar argument, which he makes *inſtar omnium*; for the unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in the believing Wife, &c. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.*

The ſcope of the Apoſtle here is to hold forth ſome ſpecial Goſpel-priviledge annexed to the *ſtate:* and he frames his argument by no ordinary medium, of the lawfulneſſe of the marriage according to a natural or poſitive rule, but *à majori*, from an eminent advantage they had together in the Goſpel: For,

1. The

1. The unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in, or, to, or by the Wife.

2. The Children in ſuch a ſtate are holy, as if they had been both believers.

That the Apoſtle holds out a Goſpel-priviledge, not common to meer unbelievers in their marriage ſtate, is clear;

1. Becauſe the Apoſtle puts the advantage on the believers ſide, and there fixeth it; the unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in the Wife, as believing; and ſo contrarily, the unbelieving Wife in the Husband: So *Beza* affirms that in two ſpecial Copies he finds the words thus read, ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ πίστει, ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ πίστῳ neither can it hold ſame with the former words but as thus read: And if it had not been the Apoſtles proper meaning to ſhew the ſpecial priviledge the believing party hath notwithſtanding the unbeliever, he would have only ſaid, the Husband is ſanctified to the Wife, and the Wife to the Husband; that would have been the plaineſt and leaſt ambitious expreſſion of ſuch a ſentence: and the Apoſtle would never have made an argument of four terms, when three could only ſatisfie; for all know, that an argument with four terms is moſt deceitful and falſe.

2. The Apoſtle doth uſe higher terms & phraſes in this argument, then is ever uſed in Scripture to expreſs a meer lawful or common priviledge, as to be ſanctified in the Wife, & the Children to be holy; expreſſions of another dialect then to hold forth a civil

civil,or natural,or legal conjunction;being fingled out in Scripture to hold forth the beſt ſtate of perſons and things in relation to God and his uſe.

And the Apoſtle uſeth two terms both negative and affirmative: *they are not unclean, but holy*; the opening of the uſe of which two words will clear the point under conſideration.

The word here (ἀκάθαρτα) *unclean*, in the Old Teſtament is commonly uſed for thoſe legal pollutions and uncleanneſſes which made men to be ſeparated from the Congregation, and excommunicated from the priviledge of Ordinances, untill they were waſhed and ſanctified; Thus in *Lev* 5.2. & 4 *Chap* 7.19 & 14 7.8. *Iſa*.52.1. *Hag*.2.13. with many other places, where *unclean* is oppoſed to a preſent ſuitable capacity for Church priviledges; but that famous place in *Act*.10.14. ſhews it moſt clear what the proper uſe of this word is; he joyns it there with what is common or prophane: When the viſion came to him of eating all ſorts of Creatures, he ſaith, *Not ſo Lord; for I have not eaten any thing that is common or unclean* (ἀκάθαρτον) This viſion was about his going to *Cornelius* to open the Goſpel to him,and bring him into the Church who was a Gentile,and ſo common &unclean,not fit for Goſpel-priviledges,as the Jews were thought to be. Now in a civil ſenſe things that are common are not unclean; but in a religious ſenſe, what is common is adjudged unclean; Now *Cornelius* being a Gentile,without the pale of the Jewiſh Church, he

cals

cals him common and unclean, as all the Gentiles were before they came under the promiſe: but God anſwered,*What God hath clenſed*, or ſanctified, *call not thou common*:*Cornelius* was not a Baſtard,nor unlawfully begotten; but he was not accounted a fit member,he was without the Church; therefore the Apoſtle cals him common and unclean: Juſt in the ſame phraſe with the Apoſtle here, when he ſaith that children are not unclean, he muſt needs mean they are not of common uſe,or to be excluded from outward priviledges of the Church: But that is not all, but he poſitively ſaith,they are (*holy*) ἅγια not only ἀκάθαρτα,*not unclean*: And this latter word is moſt uſed to expreſſe the Hebrew word קדש,which ever ſignifies what is *uſui Divino accommodatum*, that which is appropriated to a Divine uſe; which is the proper notion of holineſs in the Old & New Teſtament,and never taken otherwiſe: For the proof of which,I have compared above three hundred places in the Old Teſtament according to the Septuagint, and all the N.Teſt places where the word is uſed. And this all do grant,even Mr.*Tombes* himſelf,that the word generally is taken in ſcripture to expreſs a ſeparation of things to God,& he only brings theſe places wherein he thinks there is another uſe of it. 1 *Tim*.4.5. *Every Creature of God is good, and not to be refuſed, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is ſanctified by the Word and Prayer* (ἁγιάζεται) *Hence* ſaith he,*is meant onely the lawfull uſe of the Creature, in oppoſition to what is to be refuſed.* It is a wonder,

but

but that God leaves men to blindneſs when they leave truth, how any man of common underſtanding, finding the Word *holy* & *ſanctified*, always uſed in a religious ſenſe, ſhould fly to this place to make an exception. The Apoſtle ſaith firſt, *Every Creature which God hath made is good in it ſelf, and none to be refuſed*: that is, all may be lawfully uſed without any legal pollution, as formerly: But then he goes higher, ſpeaking of a religious uſe of outward things; *They are ſanctified by the Word and Prayer; they are all good, and lawful in their uſe to every man: but they are onely ſanctified by theſe holy means, the Word and Prayer*. And he might have as well ſaid, that the Word and Prayer are not holy means, but only lawful to be uſed, as that the ſanctification which is by the Word and Prayer; is to make the Creatures only lawful to be uſed. If a wicked man eat his meat without ſeeking a bleſſing on it, or giving thanks, will any one ſay that he hath not a lawfull uſe of the Creature? but any man may ſay, it's not ſanctified to him. The Apoſtle in theſe 2. ver. goes on *gradatim*, by degrees, from a lawful uſe to a holy uſe of the Creatures; *All is good and may be uſed, but they are ſanctified by the Word and Prayer:* thus you ſee the nature of this priviledged place.

But the main place Mr. *Tombes* alledgeth for holineſs to be uſed for what is barely civil or lawful, is that 1 *Theſ.* 4 3,4,7. *This is the will of God, your ſanctification, that you abſtain from fornication, and let every*

every one poſſeſs his veſſel in ſanctification and honor; for God hath not called us to uncleanneſs, but holineſſe. Here uncleanneſſe is taken, ſaith he, for fornication, and holineſſe for chaſtity.

To which I anſwer with Mr. *Marſhal*, That chaſtity among the Heathens is never called ſanctification, but among Believers it is, being a part of the new Creation, & one branch and part of their ſanctification, wrought by the Spirit of God. And though Mr. *Tombes* ſaith this is but a ſhift, yet he ſhall ſee it demonſtrative, if he obſerve the phraſes in the Text, and the nature of ſanctification; in the 1, & 2. ver. the Apoſtle beſeecheth & exhorteth them *to walk as they had received from him how to walk, and to pleaſe God according to the rules of Jeſus Chriſt*; and he urgeth it in ver. the 3. with this, *It's the will of God, even your ſanctification, that is, that you ſhould walk in all holineſſe, ſutable to the bleſſed rules of the Goſpel*, and as one part and expreſſion of holineſſe, to abſtain from ſin: And he inſtanceth ſpecially in fornication, which was the common and reigning ſin among the Gentiles: So that if you view the place you ſhall find, That,

1 He ſpeaks of ſanctification in general, in its full latitude, ver. 3. as ſutable to all the will and mind of God; *This is the will of God, even your ſanctification*; that is, it is Gods command, & Gods delight to ſee you ſanctified: then he brings in abſtinence from fornication (the ſin of the times) as one part of that holineſſe God requires. For ſanctification may

be considered, as it lies in vivification, or in mortification, which for distinctions sake we may call the two parts of sanctification. Now chastity in itself, as in the Heathens & natural men, is not properly a part of sanctification; some other Epithite becomes it better: Would Mr. *Tombs* call all the abstinencies and actings of the Heathens by the name of sanctifications, and speak like a Christian and a Divine? Would it be proper to say in his Pulpit (when he was speaking of the nature of holinesse and chastity) sanctified *Socrates*, holy *Aristides*? And can he think the Apostle would express that which is common among Heathens, in such a high Gospel-dialect, as sanctification is appropriated always in Scripture to God, Angels, Saints, and their highest graces and workings, and to things raised above common use, dedicated to God and his service, but that he meant it according as the whole tenure of scripture defines holinesse? How much will the phrase of holinesse and sanctification be debased and made common, if that sense should be admitted, contrary to the Scripture-use of the Word? But that is a weak case that puts men to such extraordinary shifts to maintain.

But to go on a little further; The same word is used by the Apostle in all his salutations, & inscriptions of his Epistles to all the Churches, τοῖς ἁγίοις, *to the Saints* or holy ones at *Rome*, at *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Ephesus*, &c. which when appropriated to persons, alwayes signifies a visible Saint:

Se

So here, when he calls Children of believing Parents holy, he cannot but mean they are to be accounted as visible *Saints*, untill they do profess the contrary; and I know no reason can be given why the meaning of the Apostle in his Epistle, when he writes τοῖς ἁγίοις, *to the Saints*, should not be as well understood written onely to the legitimate, and those that are not bastards at *Rome*, *Corinth*, &c. as well as for them to interpret the same word so in this place: For ἅγιος, when applyed to grown men, must signifie visible and Evangelical holinesse; and must be translated Saints: but when applied to Children, it must only signifie legitimacy, that they are not *Bastards*, when all men know, that *magis & minus non variant speciem*; and the word is of the same import in every place of the New Testament.

Ob. If any shall be so critical as Mr *Tombes* is, to enquire how they can be said to be holy: what holinesse is here meant, whether inherent, or imputative, or visible?

Sol. I answer, It's a holiness of special separation to God, & his use, as a peculiar people: Some call it a federal holines, from the ground of the priviledg: others an Ecclesiastical, or Church holines, from the account & esteem the Church ought to have of such Children: but the first more fully answers the largest use of the word in Scripture. As for Infants.

1. They are capable of inherent holinesse.
2. They are in Covenant, as we have proved,

and so have a holy relation on them.

3. They are capable of separation to Gods u from the womb, and so of being holy to God.

4. By the same reason we account grown m holy, we may account Infants of believers holy; f these that make a profession may have no inward inherent holinesse; and a bare profession is not h linesse; we only account them holy by a judicio charity; and we are often deceived, and have ca to repent of our judgements: Infants may be i wardly sanctified, and God hath taken them int the Covenant with their Parents, & would have look on them as separated to himself; which ground enow to build our charity on, as to esteem them holy, as grown persons. There is no diffe ence but this in it; That concerning the holin of persons at age, we trust our own judgements, in judging of Infants we trust Gods Word, who h comprehended them under the promise with thei Parents; there had been as many deceits in the vert, in our judgement of those of riper years, as that which is acted through a mixture of faith charity on Infants. And Gods promise, though n v rso indefinit, is a surer ground for hope, than m probable judgement; which is the most I can ha of the generality of Professors of riper years.

Q. But if any one say further, What is this t Baptism? here is no mention of it in this place.

Sol. It's true, baptism is not mentioned her but here is mention of a qualified subject for Ba

tism

tism, which is all that is contended for. And if the Apostle had said they were believers, then these of the contrary opinion would conclude, here is enough for Baptism; but its all one, in that he calls them holy, which you see is more than legitimate; and you may translate it with as much propriety, *Else were your Children impure, but now they are Saints*; that is, so to be esteemed through Gods Covenant, as if they had professed their own faith.

Lastly, as it would be most absurd to imagine the Apostle should use a pure religious word to express a common & ordinary priviledge: so there would be no considerable *medium* for augmentation in that sense, & no such force in ἐπεὶ ἄρα (*else were, &c.*) which hath force from the specialness of the priviledge to their issue, not only to be lawfully begotten, as the Children of unbelievers are when lawfully married. but, to be in a peculiar state of separation to God, and to be accounted fit members with the believing Parent of the visible Church of Christ.

And what a poor & cold answer, as to comfort, would it be, when the believer was scrupled about abiding with his or her unbelieving yoke-fellow, to tell them, Continue together; for your Children shall not be Bastards: but how full of strength and sweetness must it be, if taken in the contrary sense, Remaine with your yoke fellows, though unbelievers; they are sanctified to you, & you shall notwithstanding bring forth a holy seed; a seed of God,

as the old Testament expression; in Covenant, as if you were both believers: this sounds like a *medium* most demonstrative and consolatory, both for satisfaction & comfort: What plainer testimony, or fairer character can be written to shew the qualification of Infants of believers, than to write them holy, & give them the same name that is given to Christ, and Saints in Heaven and Earth?

CHAP. VIII.

The Harmonie that notable Chapter, Rom. 11. *hath with the former Scriptures; the* 15, 16, 17, *verses especially opened.*

THAT the Adversaries of this truth may see we want not a harmonie of Scriptures to confirm our judgement, the next place to be considered of is that, *Rom.* 11. especially ver. 15, 16, 17 of that Chapter; which if well weighed, will demonstrate the holinesse and Church-membership of the Children of believing Gentiles, as much as of the Jews Children that descended naturally from *Abraham.*

The scope of the whole Chapter is to discover the breaking off, or casting away of the Jewish Nation from being a Church, and the priviledge the Gentiles get by this, & their ingrafting into the same root; and the promise of the restauration of the

the Jews again, when the fulnes of the Gentiles should come in, and every one of these expresst with variety of notions, & interlined with many cautions concerning Gods actings in this great dispensation. Concerning the full explication of this Chapter, Mr, *Cobbet* and Mr. *Baxter* have done worthily, and have with much clearnesse argued for Infants Church-membership from it. I shall onely for methods sake, and your satisfaction, open the main and most controverted terms in this Chapter concerning this subject. As,

1. What this breaking off, or casting away of the Jews imports, and from what they are broken off; from the visible or invisible Church, v. 15.

2. What is meant by the first-fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches; and how it can be affirmed; that if the root be holy, so are the branches, v. 16.

3. What this ingraffing is, and how the gentiles are said to be ingraffed, and to be partakers of the fatnesse of the Olive, v. 17. For the first, This casting off, and breaking off, is not from the invisible, but the visible Church.

1. This will maintain falling away from grace, and please the Arminians, the great Enemies of the Gospel of free grace: but this the Apostle prevents ver. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. by anticipation of that Objection, distinguishing the Elect, and himself as one of them from being cast off: *I say then, hath God cast away his people whom he foreknew? God forbid. I also am an Israelite,*

Israelite, &c. If the casting off meant here was from the invisible Church, then *Paul* and the other Elect among the Jews were cast off from that Church; but *God forbid*, saith *Paul*, v. 5. there is a remnant at this present time according to the election of grace, whereof *Paul* was one; therefore it must be from the visible Church they were broken off: But here the *Arminians* and *Pelagians* agree with these that are against Infant-baptism, as they do in many other opinions. Mr *Tombes* hath nothing to say in his *Examen* of Mr. *Marshal*, Sermon, to avoid this absurdity, but only this, pag. 64.

The meaning is not (saith he) *of some of the branches in the invisible Church; but as when our Saviour Christ using the same similitude, says*, Joh. 15. 2. Every branch in me not bearing fruit, he taketh away: *The meaning is, not that any branch in him could be fruitless, or taken away; but he calleth that a branch in him, which was so in appearance: so the Apostle speaking of branches broken off, means it not of such as were truly so, but so in appearance.* Thus far he.

Which is a granting of what he denies; for to be a branch in appearance, is only to be a visible branch; and no branch that is meerly in appearance so, and not really, is one of the invisible Church, nor can ever be said to be broken from it, but only from his visible state which he hath, but (δοκήσει) v. 15, 16. as a branch in outward priviledges, and seeming graces.

2. The breaking off, &c. it was of the Jewish Nation

Nation, of the collective body, though not of every individual, and therefore it must needs be from the visible Church: for as a nation they were a church, and the whole Nation was cast away and rejected; now as a Nation they were not all members of the invisible Church, ver. 7. 8. with ver. 17.

3. Its a visible breaking off, therefore cannot be from the invisible Church, ver. 3, 4, 5. 17, 18, 19. For as Mr *Baxter* well observes, *There can be no visible removing from an invisible term.*

4. Its a breaking off the natural branches, so he cals the Jews: Now the body of the Jewish Church were not natural branches in a spiritual sense; for they believed not as *Abraham* did; but only called so as they were naturally descended from his loyns, & were members of the visible Church, & first partakers of the outward priviledges of the Covenant made with him: Thus the Apostle distinguisheth of the body of the Jewish Nation, *Rom.* 9. where after he had reckoned up all the priviledges of the Israelites in general, v. 4. *Who are Israelites, to whom pertains the adoption & the glory, & the Covenants, &c.* making way by this to shew the sadness of their rejection, in v. 6. To prevent the same Objection, the Apostle in this Chapter saith, *They are not all* Israel *which are of* Israel; that is, not all spiritual, though all natural branches; & these priviledges did visibly belong to all. As for that distinction of *Abrahams* being a natural & a spiritual Father, it may go for current until they come to apply it, and then it is most

most vain; for all that came from *Abraham* as a naturalFather,had a titleto all theſe priviledges forementioned, which belonged to the viſible Church until they did degenerate, and caſt themſelves out,us *Iſhmael* and E*ſau*,*&c*. But of this formerly.

Laſtly, *if* they were broken off from the inviſible Church, it muſt be either from union withChriſt, or communion withChriſt and his Spirit;for this is the true definition of the inviſible Church, that in it ſouls have reall union and communion with God in Chriſt through the Spirit: but none of the Jews that were broken off had ſuch a union or communion, and therefore could not be broken off from it: But ſo far they may be ſaid to be broken off from the inviſible Church, as by remote conſequence,as they were excluded from all the meanes of grace, and the Ordinances; which are the uſual ways and methods of God to bring ſoul into communion with himſelf.

2. Let us conſider what is meant by the firſt-fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches: There be many opinions concerning this, eſpecially two muſt be debated; ſome think it Chriſt,as thoſe that follow *Origen*, and the allegorical Fathers: But that firſtly and primarily by the firſt-fruits and the lump and the root, and the branches, cannot be meant Chriſt neither perſonally nor myſtically, is moſt clear if we conſider,

Ego aliam ſanctam radicem neſcio, niſi Dominum noſtrum. Orig.

1. Jeſus

1. Jeſus Chriſt was not the firſt-fruits in regard of the whole lump of the Jewiſh Nation, and ſo cannot anſwer to the firſt ſimilitude.

2. Jeſus Chriſt cannot be ſaid to be root unto theſe which were caſt away; no branches really in him are cut off, but ſo were they;for that place of the 15. of *John*, ver. 2. which ſeemeth to ſpeak of ſome branches which are in Chriſt,and yet are taken away for not bearing fruit: it may be better read,and according to the *Syriak*,thus;*every branch that brings not forth fruit in me, he takes away*; that is,that do bring forth ſome ſeeming fruit,but not as in Chriſt, as root and principle.

3. In ver. 24. the Jews when they ſhall be called, it is ſaid, *They ſhall be graffed into their own Olive:* Now Chriſt is not properly their own Olive, but ſo is *Abraham*, &c.

4. The Jews are ſaid (as formerly) to be natural branches of this root, but ſo they were not of Chriſt; but Chriſt was a natural branch from that ſtock, *Rom.* 9.5 *Whoſe are the Fathers; of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came.*

Mr. *Tombes* himſelf ingenuouſly confeſſeth this, page 67. of his *Examen*, *That by the root cannot be meant Chriſt*; and gives us the hint of another argument from thoſe expreſſions, v. 24. of ſome branches, wild κατὰ φύσιν, *according to nature*; and of ingraffing in, παρὰ φύσιν *contrary to nature*, into this Olive; he concludes the root cannot be Chriſt: for Chriſt hath no natural or preternatural branches in him;

him;all are wild ere they be ingraffed into him as a living root: And the other expreſſion, v. 18. of our not bearing the root, but the root us, if we boſt againſt the Jews, doth evidently demonſtrate, that the root here is not properly meant of Chriſt, though he be the eternal root of all ſpiritual happineſſe, ſet forth gloriouſly in many other places of Scripture.

Others by the root mean the Covenant: But the beſt and moſt genuine ſenſe is to interpret it of *Abraham* with whom, and with his ſeed, as ſo many branches, the Covenant was made, and by which both the root and the branches were made holy: And this anſwers fully to both the ſimilitudes. For

1. It's an alluſion to the Legal rights about the firſt-fruits which were to be offered up to God; and by that all the whole maſs, all the fruits that came after were accounted holy: Thus *Abraham* was the firſt-fruits of the Jews: he believing firſt, and being in Covenant, all the lump, the whole body of the Jewiſh Nation were taken in to be a Church, and were accounted holy.

2. As a root it anſwers to him from whom all the Jews ſprang up, and from whom they drew all their Church-privileges, as their breath: Thus the Lord by the Prophet in *Iſa.* 51.1,2. bids the Jews to *look to the rock out of which they were hewen, and the pit out of which they were digged:* he meanes it of *Abraham* firſt, as appears by the ſecond verſe; *Look to Abraham your Father, and to* Sarah *that bare you;*

for

for I called him alone, and bleſſed & increaſed him, &c.

Ob. But what kind of conſequence is this? and how doth the Apoſtle make uſe of this? *If the firſt-fruits be holy, ſo is the lump; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches:* From what principle doth the Apoſtle argue?

Sol. The Apoſtle in the former verſe ſpeaks of a receiving in again of the Jewiſh Nation, & brings in this as a ground to hope for it. *There is yet a holy root which hath an influence on the branches; and argues, that if the root be holy, when the branches broken off ſhall be re ingraffed, they ſhall be holy likewiſe.* The like phraſe you have in v. 28. *As touching the Goſpel they are enemies for your ſake: but as touching the Election, they are beloved, διὰ τοὺς πατέρας, for their Fathers ſake; God having ſo caſt his election, as to run in that vein moſt eminently:* And ſome do render it, *They are beloved through their Fathers:* But this is clear;

1. That *Abraham*, or as ſome ſay, *Abraham Iſaac* and *Jacob* were the root.

2. That he argues from the holineſſe of the root to the holineſſe of the branches: that is, from them as Parents to their poſterity as Branches.

3. That this was an uſual and common principle of arguing in Scripture, from the Parent to the Poſterity; for elſe he had ſpoken in the dark, & had proved *notum per ignotius*, if they could not univerſally reaſon from it, & if you obſerve, he writes is as an Axiom of the greateſt demonſtration, and

never

never ſtands to prove it further.

4. It had been an argument of no force for to prove the calling in of the Jews, and their happy ſtate upon re-ingraffing, to tell them, *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches; and they are beloved for the Fathers ſake*, if there were not a virtue ſtill in the root to derive holineſſe to them, when they ſhould be received in, and ingraffed to their own Olive; he lays all the weight on the root; being ſtill holy and freſh, though the branches be broken off And what can you make of this as to argumentation? *If the root be holy*, Ergo *the branches*; and apply it to Perſons and Parents, but in a moral and imputative conſideration.

5. But holineſſe is not propagated by nature, from the parent to his Child; and we all derive ſin by nature from our Parents; and are, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Eph.* 2. 2. *by nature the Children of wrath, &c.* and as *David* ſaith, *Conceived in ſin.*

Sol. 1. It's true, we are ſo; and there is no holineſſe propagated by nature, take it for internal habits; as a wiſe man doth not convey his wiſdom, or a vertuous man his vertue to his Child, neither can a Believer convey his faith and other graces to his Child; and in this ſenſe *Abraham* is not a root, he begets no believer; and under this conſideration the argument cannot hold; *Abraham* in this ſenſe is onely a root, παραδειγματικῶς, *exemplary only*; Chriſt is ἐνεργετικῶς, *effectually, to convey ſimilar graces*: But,

2. There

2. There is a holineſſe by gratious eſtimation or imputation, which flows from Gods Covenant, or ſome ſpecial priviledge given to ſuch a ſtock, or kindred, or Nation; God taking ſuch a family, ſuch a ſtock, and ſeparates it to himſelf for ſome holy uſe, and ſo bleſſeth them: And thus it was with *Abraham*, and is moſt common in the Scriptures, and according to the nature of priviledges among men, where the ſon of a freeman is free, & the ſon of a Nobleman a Nobleman; & by way of alluſion, (though it doth not hold in all particulars) as in juſtification, Chriſts righteouſneſſe is imputed, & we accounted holy by it: So as to ſome ſpecial priviledges, the root, the Parent being holy, and in the Covenant, his Child hath the advantage of it; not meritoriouſly from the Parents faith, but virtually through Gods gracious promiſe to the believer and his ſeed. But,

3. This is not by natural generation, for then it ſhould be to all Children; but by grace and proportion; its Gods good pleaſure thus to derive the priviledge, and out of ſpecial reſpect to the Parents & to encourage them in their own faith, & ſtrengthen them in their hopes concerning their ſeed: thus did God chooſe out *Abraham* and his family from all the world, and bleſſed him; yet it was not from nature his ſeed were more bleſſed than all the world beſides. But as Dr. *Willet* ſaith well on this place, *The branches are holy, becauſe of this holy root; not by an actual and inherent holineſſe, but by a pre-*

rogative

rogative of grace grounded on the promise of God made to believing Fathers and their seed, which is the same in the New Testament as in the Old; and in this sense the argument is strong, and enforcing the scope of the Apostle. So that though the generation be natural, the derivation of a Title to Church-priviledges, and the characteristical note of holinesse is given them by grace in the Covenant, which takes in the branches with the root. In no sense besides can this argument be true, without you make the root Christ: which you see cannot be meant in this place without great absurdities.

The third and special term to be opened, is, what this ingrafting is of the Gentiles into the root, and how they are ingrafted? v. 17, 19.

For the understanding of this, Mr. *Marshall* hath laid down a sure position, which neither Mr. *Tombs*, *who is the most learned Adversary of this Truth*, nor any other hath or can shake; and that is, *That the ingrafting in of the gentiles must be sutable to the breaking off the Jews; as they were broken off, so are we ingraffed*: This the Apostle clearly proves in every verse. in v. 17. *Thou being a wilde Olive*, speaking of the Gentiles collectively considered, wert ingrafted, ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in, amongst them*; so *Gratius* translateth it, *Positus es inter ramos illius arboris*, Thou art set among the branches of that tree; and so referring to the first words of the verse, which is implyed, that some remained still; for but some of the branches were broken off, and the Gentile believers

lievers were inoculated among them, and by a special adoption were partakers of the same priviledges; according to that of the Poet *Ovid*:

Venerit insitio: fac ramum, ramus adoptet.

But the best reference is to the former part of the verse, as it speaks of these branches which were broken off; the believing Gentiles were ingrafted, (ἐν αὐτοῖς) that is, as *Beza* and the *Syriack* translates it, *pro ipsis*, for them, that is, *in ramorum defractorum locum*, in the room or stead of the branches which were broken off; they were taken away, we ingrafted: Others translate it, *cum illis*, with them, which remained when we were inserted: but either interpretation will become the sense of the place.

Now the reasons which flow from this Text concerning the subject which we have in hand, may be rather slighted than answered: This position being laid down, *We believing Gentiles are ingraffed into Abrahams Covenant, in the room of the natural branches which were broken off*: Now,

1. The Jews and their children were broken off from the Church, their children being members as well as themselves; therefore believing Gentiles and their children are engraffed in, the ingrafting in is sutable to the breaking off: they have nibbled about this reason; but the best of these adversaries have never said any thing yet, as to satisfie a rational Saint.

2. Some branches were not broken off, for so it is implyed, in that he saith, *If some were broken off*, and if they were not broken off, then not their children; for it was not only a breaking off personally, but of succession, and of their posterity with themselves: Now if we be ingraffed among these, or with these that are not broken off, we and our Children must likewise be ingraffed in; else there will be a schism between Jew and Gentile, in enjoying the priviledges naturally flowing from the same root: No man will be so bold as to say, that the believing Jews were broken off; and if not they, then not their Children which were then Infants, and had not acted unbelief: for either they must be broken off for their own sins, or their Fathers; not for their Fathers, for some of them were believers and not broken off; not for themselves, for some of them were Infants; therefore some Infants were not broken off; for their Fathers continued in the faith, and we believing Gentiles are ingraffed in among them; therefore our Children also.

3. In the latter end, when the Jews shall be ingraffed in again to their own Olive, which is promised in this Chapter, they and their Children shall be taken in, v. 26. *And so all* Israel *shall be saved*; and our ingraffing in is still suitable to theirs.

4. The Gentiles are said to partake of the root and the fatnesse of the Olive tree, in the same verse; this (Συγκοινωνὸς τ῀ ῥίζης) signifies the full participation and fellowship in all the priviledges & advantages

ages of the root, as the Jews had. Now their priviledge was not personal to themselves, but to their posterity; and therein lay the fatnesse of that Olive, in the fulnesse and large extent of its priviledge and seminal vertue, that it comprehended Parent and Child. So that as the Jews casting off was not only personal, but Politique, that is, of them and theirs: so our ingraffing in their room is; and as they had the fatnesse of the root and Olive once, so have we. Now we could not be said to be, (Συγκοινωνὸς τ῀ ῥίζης & πίστης & ἐλαίας) *To have a mutual fellowship with the Jews in the root and fatnesse of it*, if we be only personally ingraffed, and they and theirs broken off œconomically; if there be a fellowship, it must be at least in substantials: And this was the most eminent and substantial priviledge of the Jews, that they and their posterity were taken into the same Covenant: The Apostle opens this further in *Eph* 3.6

And especially, if we remember, that their breaking off, and our ingraffing, is into the visible Church as is formerly proved, and must needs be granted; for all that were broken off, were not broken off from election, and the invisible Church; neither are all the Gentiles which are ingraffed in, elected, and really of the invisible Church. So that the result is this.

1. That there is a real ingraffing of the believing Gentiles into the same root from which the unbelieving Jews were broken off.

2. This breaking off was from the visible Church, and its priviledges, not from the invisible; so is the

ingraffing of us into the visible Church.

3. As their casting out was of them and their posterity, so is our graffing in of us and our Children; These conclusions flow naturally from the Text; and all other deductions will be but as dregs after the spirit are extracted.

4. And to add to the rest this consideration, That if the posterity of the Gentiles be not taken in as the Jews were, there will be the greatest inequality of the communication of the fatness of the root that can be imagined; and the Jews may rather boast against the believing Gentiles, than they against them: seeing the root conveyed priviledges to them and their posterity, but onely personal priviledges to the believing Gentile; to the one a double mercy, to the other only a single.

Ob. But this great Objection may be made; No believer is now a root as *Abraham*, he is but only a branch; and therefore its not to be conceived how it can be argued from this to every believer, *If the root be holy, so are the branches*, as it may be to *Abraham*.

Sol. It's granted, every believer, nor any, cannot properly be called the root, as *Abraham* was, and in a strict sense: Yet,

1. They are ingraffed into the same root, and convey the same priviledges to their branches, as *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and the *twelve Tribes* did to their posterities, who were not properly nor absolutely the root, but branches of it; and we all know, that a

a Slip well inoculated or ingraffed, becomes afterwards a natural branch; and receives as much from the root, as these which grew naturally on it: So that its as strong to argue on the Gentiles side after ingraffing; *If the root be holy, so are the branches*; as from *Abraham* to the Jews, who were natural branches; As an adopted son, him and his have as full a title to the inheritance as a natural son.

There is onely this difference between the conveyance of priviledges of the Jews as natural branches, and the ingraffed Gentiles; That the whole body of the Jews, good and bad, were called branches; now only *Believers of the Gentiles*, who are called by the Gospel, with their children, are ingraffed into that root.

2. Though every Believer is not the proper root, but onely a branch of the root; yet for being ingraffed, he is naturalized as the Jewish branch, and so must have the same priviledge.

3. There are branches of branches; and the poorest branch hath some twigs, and spreading sprigs growing from them which are of the same consideration, and do receive of the fatness of the root as well as the main branches; and in this sense every branch may be said to be the immediate root of the lesser twigs: Thus believers ingraffed into the root are holy, and their infants that are branches of the branches immediatly sprouting forth from them, are holy also, & under the same consideration; & the argument holds still for the ingraffed branches, as

for the natural.

And as Mr. *Blake* saith well, *The branches of Anceſtors are roots of poſterity; being made a holy branch, in reference to their iſſue, they become a holy root.* This might be much more enlarged, but that I would not be voluminous; its enough that believers are ingraffed with their Children into the ſame root, as is formerly proved.

And then the argument holds firme, That theſe that are in the root, muſt partake of the fatneſſe of it; and they which are in the Covenant, cannot be denied the priviledges of it.

CHAP. IX.

Wherein Mr. Tombes *his eight Arguments in his* Apology *againſt Mr.* Marſhal, *for the ingraffing in, mentioned* v. 17. *to be of the Gentiles into the inviſible Church by election and ſaving faith, are examined and anſwered.*

THe great endeavor of theſe who are of the contrary opinion in opening this Chapter, is, To prove that the ingraffing of the Gentiles into the root is by election and ſaving faith, and ſo into the inviſible Church; for they ſee their caſe is in hazard if it ſhould be meant of the viſible Church: And therefore, though enough be ſpoken before to prove what we affirm, yet becauſe Mr. *Tombes* hath laid

laid down eight Arguments with ſo much confidence on the other ſide as unanſwerable; I think it not amiſs to beſtow one Chapter in the diſcovery of the unſoundneſs of his reaſons, that the truth may have a fairer paſſage into your underſtanding without clouds or demurs.

His firſt reaſon is, *Apologie p.* 71. *That ingraffing which is by Gods ſole power, it is into the inviſible Church: but ſo is the ingraffing of the Iews,* v. 3. Ergo. *For God is able to graff them.*

Sol. 1. As to argue from Gods power to his will, is alwayes unſound in Divinity and in Reaſon; God is able, therefore he will: So,

2. To argue from power to election, is of the ſame nature; for election is ſeldome or never attributed to Gods power, but to his will or good pleaſure.

3. To argue from Gods power in general, to the putting of it forth abſolutely in ſuch a determinate act, is as ſtrange; God is able to graffe them in, Ergo it muſt be into the inviſible Church; as if God ſhewed nothing of his power, but in the workings of ſaving grace; eſpecially if we conſider what a power it is, and onely from God: But to take the very prejudice the Jews have even from the letter of the Goſpel to bring them but to confeſſe Chriſt, after ſo long a darkneſſe as it was in the beginning of the Goſpel, but to make the Gentiles but outwardly own and profeſs the Goſpel, and yet not members of the inviſible Church; to take away the very groſsneſſe

groſneſs of naturall darkneſſe and ignorance, is a work of mighty power; And to an outward converſion, where perſons have been long under the power of darkneſſe, there needs the ſole power of God.

4. The Apoſtle may well put in rather Gods power than his will, when he ſpeaks of the ingrafſing in of the Jews; for it will require an act of power to gather them but viſibly once again, and bring them into one entire body to make a viſible Church, when they are ſo ſcattered up & down all Nations, and at ſuch a diſtance one from another, that it is as the gathering of the bones of dead men; and ſo its likened to the reſurrection from the dead, v. 15. So that we need go no further to enquire why their ingraffing ſhould be attributed to Gods power, ſeeing there is need enough of a Divine power but to gather them together from the four winds, to make a collective body, and ſo to be a viſible Church.

Beſides, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of power in working of ſaving faith, he doth put other Epithites to ſet it forth: & not only barely ſpeaks of power which God puts forth in all acts, but exceeding great acts of power, *Eph.* 1.21,22.

Arg. 2. His ſecond Argument is, *That ingraffing which is called reconciliation, oppoſite to caſting away, that is by election and giving faith: but ſo is the ingraffing called.* v. 15.

Sol. If he means reconciliation in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, as it denotes pardon of ſins, and being made friends

friends with God by Chriſts attonement and mediatorſhip, which muſt be his ſenſe, if he ſpeak like himſelfe: Then many abſurdities may follow.

1. That the Jews and their rejection was the ground of the Gentiles reconciliation unto God.

2. That no reconciliation was obtained for the Gentiles before the Jews were broken off.

3. That thoſe which are reconciled, and their ſins pardoned, may be caſt off, for ſo were the Jews; and the Gentiles threatned with the ſame miſery on the ſame ground, v. 20.

4. As there is external and eternal ſalvation ſpoken of, 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. ſo there may be an outward and inward reconciliation; the Gentiles were caſt out from the viſible Church for ſo many hundreds of years, without any hope or promiſe, *And ſtrangers to the Commonwealth of Iſrael*, Epheſ. 2. 11,12. and ſo viſibly caſt off; and it was a great reconciliation but to break down the middle wall of partition between Jew & Gentile, as to viſible priviledges and Ordinances: And ſo by the reconciling the world may be more properly meant the bringing them in under the means of the Goſpel, and the outward diſpenſations of the Church; which is Gods common way and method of ſalvation; and which to ſome is real and effectual unto inward grace, unto others only to outward priviledges

And the very phraſe, *the reconciliation of the world*, to Orthodox ears, deafens and daſheth the other interpretation; for the body of the Gentile-world (which

(which he means) are not ſo reconciled as by election and ſaving grace, though the ſound of the Goſpel hath gone through all the world.

Ob. 3. *Thirdly*, ſaith he, *the ingraffing muſt be meant of that act whereby the branch ſtands in the tree as a branch: but that is by giving of Faith. The minor is proved alſo*, v. 20. *they were broken off by unbelief, and we ſtand by faith, &c.*

Sol. Its true, the ingraffing is by faith, as their breaking off was by unbelief: but as their unbelief was ſhewn in a publique rejection of the Goſpel, and by it they and their Children were broken off: ſo the Gentiles are ingraffed in by publique profeſſion of faith, and acceptation of the Goſpel for themſelves and their Children; and this muſt needs be the Apoſtles meaning: For,

1. Ver. 18. He bids the Gentiles not to boaſt againſt the branches that were broken off. Now how could they boaſt againſt them but for viſible priviledges? inviſible, are out of cognizance to others: Do Saints boaſt againſt one another for election and reprobation? theſe ſecrets of the Almighty: This Argument Mr. *Baxter* urgeth with much advantage, in his Book.

2. In v. 19 he explains further what the nature of their boaſting might be; thou wilt ſay The branches were broken off, that I might be ingraffed: now can any man conceive they ſhould boaſt becauſe the branches, the Jews were broken from election and true faith, that they might be graffed in by a new act of

Gods

Gods election, and by true and ſaving faith? So in ver 20, 21, 22, 23. he exhorts the Gentiles *to look to their ſtanding, and to take heed leaſt they be broken off alſo; For if God ſpared not the naturall branches, &c. much leſſe will he ſpare thee:* What, are they exhorted to look to, leaſt they be cut off from Gods election, &c. Will Mr. *Tombes* turn a down-right *Arminian* that he may have any plea againſt the baptizing of poor Infants?

There is a twofold way of ingraffing, either by ſpiritual implantation into Chriſt, or by viſible profeſſion of faith; and both theſe ſhould meet in one perſon, though they may alſo be ſeparated; a viſible Profeſſor may not have ſaving faith within, *yet may have:* So here, the ingraffing in is into the viſible Church by viſible profeſſion; among which ſome are, ſome are not inviſible members: but the very *terminus* of ingraffing is not into the inviſible, but the viſible Church; for neither the Apoſtle, nor an Angel could tell who were ingraffed into the inviſible Church, nor who broken off, but only from the viſible Church, firſt as the proper term, and then by conſequence from the inviſible; for from this Church none were abſolutely broken off that ever were in, and into it few ingraffed.

So that if the ingraffing be viſible, the term muſt be viſible alſo: but the ingraffing is viſible, *Ergo* the term is ſo: This is according to Mr. *Tombes* his own form of argumentation, from the term to the ingraffing; the major is proved before.

Ob.

Ob. *Fourthly, That ingraffing is meant,* v, 17. *whereby the wild Olive is co partaker of the root and fatneſs of the Olive; but ſuch is only election and ſaving faith*; he proves the *minor* by diſtinguiſhing who the root is, which he well affirms to be *Abraham.*

Sol. To which there needs no other anſwer than what Mr *Blake* hath given him; *If the root be* Abraham, *and the ingraffing in be only by election, and derivation of ſaving graces* (which he means by *the fatneſs of the Olive*) *then it muſt be that we are all elect in* Abraham *as a common root*; Abraham *may ſay, Without me you can do nothing.*

To which Mr. *Tombes* only anſwers by confeſſion, *That it would follow if he made* Abraham *a root as Chriſt communicating ſaving faith: but I make* Abraham *a root as the Father of Believers, not by begetting faith, but as an exemplary cauſe.* How poor an evaſion is this of ſo confident a man in his opinion, I ſubmit to judgement.

Let him mind his Argument, and the force of it; *That ingraffing is meant whereby the wild Olive is partaker of the fatneſs of the root: but that is only election and ſaving grace, &c.*

1. Were not the natural branches which were broken off partakers of the fatneſſe of the root? and were they all elected and partakers of ſaving graces or outward priviledges only? and why then ſhould it be thought abſurd for the Gentiles by ingraffing to partake of the fatneſs of the root only in outward priviledges, ſeeing it was ſo with the natural bran-

branches, and they all grow on the ſame root?

2. The old abſurdity will ariſe ſtill from this, *That Saints may fall away from election and ſaving grace.*

3. How can he imagine *Abraham* to be the root, and the fatneſs of the root to be election and ſaving graces, and that engraffing the way of being co-partakers with the root, and yet deny Mr. *Blakes* Argument, *That we are elected in* Abraham?

1. It is improper to call a root an exemplary cauſe, there is no harmonie betweene them; an example conveyes nothing; here is a conveyance of fatneſs.

2. How unſuitable to good language is it to ſay, That ſuch are partakers of the fatneſs or fulneſs of an example? can we think the Apoſtle would ſo far over-reach?

3. Were the Jews partakers of the fatneſs of *Abraham* in the Covenant, meerly as from an exemplary cauſe? had not they it from him as a naturall Father, God making the Covenant with him and his ſeed? and do not ingraffed branches afterwards become as natural?

He only adds, p. 73. *That if it were meant of outward priviledges, it were falſe; for the Gentiles were not partakers of the outward priviledges of* Abraham.

Sol. Abraham is a root in the New Teſtament as well as in the Old, and ſtill ſtands by virtue of the Covenant to *Believers* and their Children: And though Old Teſtament Ordinances were taken away with the Jews, and that Church-ſtate, yet the root is not taken away; but the New Teſtament-priviledges grow

Ob. *Fourthly, That ingraffing is meant,* v, 17. *whereby the wild Olive is co partaker of the root and fatneſs of the Olive; but ſuch is only election and ſaving faith*; he proves the *minor* by diſtinguiſhing who the root is, which he well affirms to be *Abraham.*

Sol. To which there needs no other anſwer than what Mr *Blake* hath given him; *If the root be* Abraham, *and the ingraffing in be only by election, and derivation of ſaving graces* (which he means by *the fatneſs of the Olive*) *then it muſt be that we are all elect in* Abraham *as a common root*; Abraham *may ſay, Without me you can do nothing.*

To which Mr. *Tombes* only anſwers by confeſſion, *That it would follow if he made* Abraham *a root as Chriſt communicating ſaving faith: but I make* Abraham *a root as the Father of Believers, not by begetting faith, but as an exemplary cauſe.* How poor an evaſion is this of ſo confident a man in his opinion, I ſubmit to judgement.

Let him mind his Argument, and the force of it; *That ingraffing is meant whereby the wild Olive is partaker of the fatneſs of the root: but that is only election and ſaving grace, &c.*

1. Were not the natural branches which were broken off partakers of the fatneſſe of the root? and were they all elected and partakers of ſaving graces or outward priviledges only? and why then ſhould it be thought abſurd for the Gentiles by ingraffing to partake of the fatneſs of the root only in outward priviledges, ſeeing it was ſo with the natural bran-

branches, and they all grow on the ſame root?

2. The old abſurdity will ariſe ſtill from this, *That Saints may fall away from election and ſaving grace.*

3. How can he imagine *Abraham* to be the root, and the fatneſs of the root to be election and ſaving graces, and that engraffing the way of being co-partakers with the root, and yet deny Mr. *Blakes* Argument, *That we are elected in* Abraham?

1. Is improper to call a root an exemplary cauſe, there is no harmonie betweene them; an example conveyes nothing; here is a conveyance of fatneſs.

2. How unſutable to good language is it to ſay, That ſuch are partakers of the fatneſs or fulneſs of an example? can we think the Apoſtle would ſo far over-reach?

3. Were the Jews partakers of the fatneſs of *Abraham* in the Covenant, meerly as from an exemplary cauſe? had not they it from him as a naturall Father, God making the Covenant with him and his ſeed? and do not ingraffed branches afterwards become as natural?

He only adds, p. 73. *That if it were meant of outward priviledges, it were falſe; for the Gentiles were not partakers of the outward priviledges of* Abraham.

Sol. Abraham is a root in the New Teſtament as well as in the Old, and ſtill ſtands by virtue of the Covenant to Believers and their Children: And though Old Teſtament Ordinances were taken away with the Jews, and that Church-ſtate, yet the root is not taken away; but the New Teſtament-priviledges grow

grow on the ſame root; & our ingraffing in gives us to be partakers of the fatneſs of them, as well as it gave to the Jews the participation of former priviledges until they were broken off.

All the reſt of his arguments are much of the ſame nature; only a touch further of each of them.

Ob. 5 From v.25. *If the breaking off the Jews be by blinding, then the ingraffing is by giving faith; but the former is true, ſo the latter.*

Sol. This is the ſame in effect with the third Argument: Yet,

1. There is not the ſame reaſon, ſeeing he takes it of giving ſaving faith; their blinding was judicial, a puniſhment for their unbelieving, rejecting of the Goſpel; though they had not ſaving faith to embrace the Goſpel; the giving of ſaving faith is not on ſuch terms; neither is ſaving faith ſo abſolutely antecedent to make a man a member of the viſible Church, as blinding is to Gods final rejection.

2. Blindneſs came but in part on *Iſrael*; it fell only on the meer viſible members, not the inviſible and elect: therefore the ingraffing muſt be onely of viſible members into the viſible Church, v. 7. The election hath obtained it, but the reſt were blinded.

Arg. 6. *If re-ingraffing of the Jews produceth ſalvation, is by turning them from their iniquity, &c. then it is to the inviſible Church: but ſo it is,* v, 26, 27 Ergo.

Sol. To which I give this faire Anſwer, That doubtleſs

doubtleſs according to thoſe promiſes, when the Jews ſhall be called in to be a viſible Church again, there ſhall be abundance of more glory be brought in with them, than ever yet the world ſaw; and the new Heavens and the new Earth, the coming down of the new *Jeruſalem*, and all thoſe glorious things are fitted to fall in with that time. And from theſe conſiderations many do interpret v. 26 literally, *And ſo ſhall all* Iſrael *be ſaved.* But yet,

1. They ſhall be ingraffed in as a viſible Church, elſe *Abraham* and the Fathers would never be mentioned as roots.

2. They ſhall be ingraffed in as they were broken off: now they were broken off as a viſible Church;

3. All that can be gathered is this, That the fulneſs of ſalvation, and the virtues of the promiſes, ſhall more fully and univerſally take effect on the Jews, even to the ſalvation of all of them; and ſo the inviſible and viſible Church be more pure; *and as one in the earth*: but this fulneſs ſhall be to them as a viſible Church, and on the earth.

Arg. 7. *If the re-ingraffing be by vertue of Gods election and love, then it is to the inviſible Church: but the former is true,* v. 28. Ergo.

Sol. 1. It's ſaid, That as touching election, the Jews are beloved for their Fathers ſake; hence it follows, God hath a love of election to Believers, and their natural ſeed; for ſo the Jews were the naturall ſeed of *Abraham:* But,

2. It's

2. It's granted that the calling fo the Jews ſhall be according to Gods election and firſt love; and that Gods election ſhall more fully take hold of the Jews at their re calling, than of any Nation: but yet ſtill the Argument is of no force to prove that their re-ingraffing, and ſo ours, is only or firſtly into the inviſible Church; for they are elected as well to be a viſible Church, as to be partakers of inward graces; and their re-ingraffing muſt be ſpecially and firſtly into the viſible Church from which they were broken off, or elſe there will be no correſpondence between their rejection and re-ingraffing.

The laſt and weakeſt Argument is this; *If the ingraffing of Jews and Gentiles be the fruit of Gods mercy, the breaking off by ſhutting up in unbelief; then it is into the inviſible Church, by election, &c. but ſo it is*; Ergo.

Sol. You ſee he hath ſpent his ſtock and ſtrength to be ſo low at laſt: This argument needs no Anſwer, but by ſhewing you the unſoundneſſe of this univerſal propoſition on which the Argument is built. *Whatever is a fruit of Gods mercy, is from election and ingraffing into the inviſible Church*: Which propoſition is moſt falſe, univerſally conſidered: Are not health, meat and drink, preſervation, all outward priviledges, fruits of Gods mercy? Is not long-ſuffering to theſe that periſh, and the affording the means of grace and ſalvation, the inſtitution of Ordinances, fruits of Gods mercy? and yet muſt they be given onely to elect ones? and do they ingraff to the inviſible Church? but *ſatis eſt repetere*: you have ſeen

ſeen the utmoſt ſtrength of the greateſt Antagoniſt to the Truth we hold out.

CHAP. X.

The Harmonie of Mat. 19.13, 14. *with* Mar. 10. 13. *and* Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17. *concerning the bringing of Infants to Chriſt, his acts to them, how far it contributes to prove Infant-baptiſm.*

YOu have ſeen how the Scriptures agree in holding out ſome ſpecial priviledges in the New Teſtament, as in the Old, to Believers and their ſeed: Let us now come to view Chriſts own carriage and actions to Infants; which ſhews both the ſpecial reſpect he had to them, and would have his Miniſters and Churches to have likewiſe. For this, compare Mat. 19. 13, 14. Mar. 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. with Luke 18. 15, 16, 17. *Where when little Children were brought to Chriſt, and his Diſciples did forbid them, Chriſt was angry, and charged them not to hinder them, for theirs was the Kingdom of Heaven; and he took them up in his arms, laid his hands upon them, and bleſſed them.* For the opening this place more clearely, conſider,

1. Who they were which were brought to Chriſt.
2. Who brought them.

3. Why the Disciples did forbid them to be brought.

4. Christs reason why he would have them not hindred.

5. Christs actions to and on them, what they amount unto.

For the first, who they were which were brought to Christ; in *Mark* they are called παιδία, and well translated *little Children*, or Infants; the word is a diminutive word, and is specially to be applied to Infants, *Luke* 1.76. *Zacharias* useth the same word of *John*, when he was newly born; *And thou Child*, (παιδίον) *shalt be called the prophet of the Highest*, &c. *Videtur esse aliqua emphasis diminutivi, hoc saltem loco minime negligenda*, saith *Beza*. The same word is given to Christ when he was in the Manger, *Mat.* 2. 11. *The wise men found* παιδίον, *the young Child*, or Infant, *with* Mary. &c. *Heb.* 11. 23. *Moses* is called παιδίον, when he was hid among the Flags. This word, saith *Hippocrates*, is given to these which are under the age of seven years; and it's mostly used among the Evangelists for to express the tendereft age of man, which is Infancy: So *Spanhem. dub. Evang.*

παιδίον, teste Hippocrate, *de primo vitæ septenio dicitur*; παῖς *autem de secundo*. Gurti.

But in *Luke* the holy Ghost useth another word of full signification for Infants (τὰ βρέφη) which word is used for a Babe in the womb, an Embryo, *Luk.* 1, 41. *When* Elizabeth *heard the salutation of* Mary, *the Babe leaped in her womb*; ἐσκίρτησε τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ

κοιλία ἀυτῆς; it's the same word: but more properly it is used for a Child newly born, a sucking babe that we carry in our armes: Thus 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Timothy* is said *to know the Scriptures from a Child*, ἀπὸ βρέφους, *from his Infancy*; not when he was an Infant, but from his Infancy; that is, as soon as ever he was past a Babe, & came to understand any thing, he was learnt the Scriptures. The same word βρέφος is given also to Christ, when the Wise men found him in swadling clouts, *Luk.* 2. 12. So that this is most clear, that they were Infants, tender young ones, Babes which were brought to Christ; And if the two words did not properly signifie Infants, yet in that it's said they were brought to Christ, would prove it; for the word προσφέρειν properly signifies *to carry*, as it's used mostly in scripture for. But,

2. Who those were that brought them, it's most probable that their Parents brought them; and these had believed themselves, or made some profession of faith; for they bring them to Christ to be under his blessing, for some special favour to be shewn by Christ to them; it was for a spiritual end they brought them, to be touched by Christ &c. to have some virtue from him; & who could have such bowels to bring Infants to Christ, but their own Parents? and to abide the frowns of the Disciples, and their checks, but Parents, who love their Children next themselves, and would have them blessed together with them? so that it's more probable it was their Parents which brought them than any others; and

that they were Believers, who had such a sense of their Infants conditions, and of Christs respects.

And besides, they were then in the Coasts of *Iudea*, where many had profest their faith, and were baptized by *Iohn*, and longed to have their Infants confirmed by Jesus Christ; especially when we look on Mat. 19. 13. *They brought them to Christ to lay his hands on them, and pray over them.*

3. If we consider why the Disciples should forbid them, and rebuked those that brought them, surely it could not be out of any cruelty to Infants, or that the Disciples had no bowels to Infants or desire they might not be happy with their Parents; their affections could not be so straightned and bound up in unnaturalnesse: but it must be from some such principle which these of the contrary judgment take up, That they were not capable, and were first to be taught; That onely grown men, and Professors of faith, were fit for Ordinances; and therefore they rebuked or chid them, and forbad them to do so any more: As if they had said, What have we to do with Children, as to outward Ordinances? they are not capable, they cannot professe their faith; and we must have persons able to hold forth the Gospel, which must be visible subjects of Christs Kingdome: Doubtless some such grounds they must needs go on, or else they must shew a strange kinde of passion against Children, most unbecoming these which had but the rags of natural affection left in them.

4. See

4. See Christs affections to them, and the reason of it; *When Christ saw it* (ἠγανάκτησε) *he was much displeased*: It's a word that is used to expresse such a kinde of sorrow as breaks the heart; also to stomack any thing, and to have the spirit raised in contempt of an unworthy action or person: Thus Christ was grieved at them, and he looked with contempt on his Disciples, as dealing most unworthily with poor Infants, in forbidding them to be brought to Christ; and therefore he commands them to suffer them to bring Infants to him, & not to forbid them. These two words shews how vehement Christ was & how much his heart was set towards Infants. You finde sometimes that Christ gave some sharpe words to his Disciples, and to *Peter* especially; but never to have his spirit to rise in indignation against them, as when they would forbid Infants to be brought to him; & that which makes Christ so earnest, must needs be of great weight; he was never so moved when they all forsook him, and *Peter* did forswear him, as when they denyed Infants to come to him.

I could wish that these, which with so much contemps and scurrillous language forbid Infants to be baptized, might read this place with observant spirits, and at least grow more sober and less violent in their expressions concerning poor Infants; doubtless it's a warning to all Christs Disciples.

Now the reason which Jesus Christ gives, is, *Of such is the Kingdom of God:* The reason shews what the priviledge was, they would exclude Infants

from,

from, *viz.* being visibly judged to belong to the Kingdom of God; and Christ saith, *Of such is the Kingdom of God.* Now take the Kingdom of God either for Heaven and Glory; or secondly by way of allusion, for the Church, and the state of the Gospel, it will serve as a full reason: Of such, that is, of Infants, is Gods Kingdom made up, as well as of grown men, and they are as fit subjects as you are: But doubtlesse he especially meanes by *the Kingdom of God*, as well the Kingdom of Grace in a visible Church, as the Kingdom of Glory; because else this could be no reason to convince the Disciples of their errour, for they were against the visible bringing Infants to Christ for to get some outward sign of favour to them; and Christ tels them, they may be as well brought to Christ, and receive a visible sign, as grown persons; for the Kingdom of God is made of such, as of others.

1. Christ shews their interest in one of the highest priviledges, *The Kingdom of God*, and that visibly.

2. He speaks it *de præsenti*; not onely respecting their future estate, what they may be; but that even now the Kingdom of God is of such.

3. He useth this as a common instructive principle for the future, never to forbid, not only these, but such like Infants to be brought to him: For τοιέτων *Of such is the Kingdom of God*: Christ would have them take it as a constant principle, That wherever they found such like Infants, they should not reject them,

them, but look on them with Gospel-respect.

Obj. These that differ have nothing to say to this, but, That Christ means it of such, as children for humility, and meekness, and lowlinesse; and therefore in the following verse he saith, *He that shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little Child; shall not enter therein.*

Sol. It's true Christ takes an occasion to exhort them to humility and meekness, from the pattern of these little ones. But,

1. Christ shewes Infants right to the Kingdom of God, as well as the disciples, and grown persons, who can professe their own faith.

2. If Christ had meant only to make an example and resemblance, he might have taken Sheep, and Doves more properly; for they are more meek and gentle than Children, who are commonly froward and peevish.

3. This crosseth the end of Christs reason, which was that Infants should not be hindred from being brought to Christ, For *of such is the Kingdom of God.* Now if he had meant of such as were onely like them in some qualities, not of themselves, there was nothing at all in Christs reason: And thus must the words be rendred on that account; *Suffer infants to come to me, and do not forbid them; for not of them, but of humble persons that resemble them, is the Kingdom of God.* Men will rather make Christ speak non-sense, than loose their opinions.

4. Can we think Christ could be so displeased with his

his Disciples for hindring little ones to be brought to him, meerly to shew them as resemblances and patterns to grown men; and add this reason, *For of such is the Kingdom of God*, when he had examples more fit to that purpose, even among the meere sensible Creatures? No, Christ shews the priviledge of such Infants; and checks his Disciples pride, who would have none but themselves and grown persons to be esteemed, as having any visible interest in the Kingdom of God.

Lastly. Let us view Christs carriage and actions to these infants; he did not onely shew them as examples, but *took them up in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them*: all expressions of the most signal love, and favour, and of great import, if duly considered.

1 He took them up in his arms, ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ the word signifies to embrace with special affections, so the French Translation *Embrasser*, *Piscator embrachiare*, *amplexabunde gesto*, Bud. Christ took them up in his arms, and held them forth as Monuments of his love; and doubtlesse to shew his Disciples, that he would have some outward sign and character of peculiar respect set on them by his Church and Saints: Such a carriage was not out of a natural affection only to these that could not pity themselves, but from a heavenly strain of love which he bore to these little ones, as to the highest professing Disciples; and must needs be symbolical to his Churches, to take heed how they reject them wholly

wholly from any visible right to the Kingdom of God: Christ was to leave the world shortly, but he leaves it as a rule to his Disciples.

2. Christ layes his hands on them, which was used among the Jews as a form of special blessing, and in the N. T. for eminent ends.

1 For to cure all sorts of diseases by a miraculous power, *Luk.* 4.40.

2. For consecration of any to a Divine work and service; thus Church-Officers were solemnly seperated to Christs work, as peculiarly fit for it, *Acts* 6.6 *Acts* 13.3. 1 *Tim.* 4.15. and 5.22. 2 *Tim.* 1.6.

3. It was used for confirmation after Baptism, and as an outward way whereby the holy Ghost was conveyed; and this is the most common use of it in the Acts of the Apostles, *Acts* 8. 17,18,19. and 19.6 where those that were baptized had the Apostles hands laid on them, and they received the holy Ghost: and to this purpose may we apply Christs act to these Infants, to confirme the promise solemnly after Baptism. For,

1. It was ever used (except to sick persons) after Baptism.

2. As it presupposeth Baptism to precede, so it's an outward sign of a special significancy, and holds forth as much as if Christ had baptized them: for in that outward rite the holy Ghost was conveyed; & by laying on of hands others received the holy Ghost, as the former Scriptures express; and why not in this act of Christ on them? Take all the circumstances

cumſtances together, and you cannot imagine it to be a complemental act; And if this were as an outward ſign of their receiving the holy Ghoſt, *What ſhould hinder water that infants ſhould not be baptized, ſeeing they have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* Acts 10.47. Chriſt laid his hands on them, *Benedictas ſcilicet manus in quas à Patre ſuo acceperat omnia bona Cœli & Terræ*, ſaith a learned Divine on this place. *He laid thoſe bleſſed hands on them, in which he had received from the Father all good things in Heaven and Earth.* This act ſhews,

1. That Chriſt would have ſome outward viſible ſign of favour ſet on ſuch Infants by Churches: and Impoſition of Hands being one of the choyceſt, Chriſt uſeth that as moſt proper to ſhew his Authority.

2. That holds forth, That if they be capable of impoſition of hands, they are of an Ordinance of like nature, which eſpecially looks at a ſubject purely paſſive.

Obj. If it be Objected, Why did not Chriſt baptize them as well as lay his hands on them, if he meant to hint out their right to Baptiſm.

Sol. It's eaſily anſwered, That Chriſt baptized none at all; but he did that which was an Ordinance uſually in thoſe Primitive times adminiſtred after Baptiſm, and equal to it, as to its dignity; and ſo far above Baptiſm, as it was more extraordinary in its practice: And ſo we may argue from this to Baptiſm, either inclufively, or *a majori*, from the greater; and

I have more from this place to confirm me, that if Chriſt baptized any, he would theſe Infants; ſeeing he ſhews ſo much reſpect to them, more than to any grown perſon; and did to them thoſe acts which were equivalent, if not ſupereminent to them, than any can have againſt it. Let any that differ from us ſhew any where in the Goſpel where Chriſt laid his hands on any but deſperate diſeaſed perſons to ſhew his power, or on Infants to ſhew his love, and confirm their antient priviledges, or upon any perſon in this latter ſenſe unbaptized.

Obj. 2. If it be ſaid, This was an extraordinary act of Chriſt, and no ordinary pattern may be drawn from it.

Sol. I anſwer; Grant it to be extraordinary, yet it argues more ſtrongly, if Chriſt uſed an extraordinary act to ſhew his affection and love to Infants, much more may the Church ſhew ordinary acts to them.

2. Chriſt ſhewed this extraordinary carriage, the more to check and convince his Diſciples for their extraordinary contempt of poor Infants, who would not allow them an ordinary intereſt in viſible priviledges. And it's conſiderable, that Impoſition of Hands was not an uſual Ordinance, or adminiſtred by any but Chriſt before the aſcenſion of Chriſt, and the ſending of the holy Ghoſt.

3. Though Chriſts act ſhould be extraordinary, in regard of the imitation of that act by us; yet he grounds it on an ordinary rule and principle; *For of*

ſuch

ſuch is the Kingdome of God; which he laies down as a fundamental rule. And this is the leaſt that can be gathered from it; That if Chriſt on this ground ſet an extraordinary ſign on Infants, becauſe the Kingdome of God did viſibly belong to them; we may on the ſame principle ſet an ordinary initiating ſign on them, as viſible members of that glorious ſtate, as well as on grown viſible Profeſſors, who are but probable members, according to the moſt judicious charity; eſpecially if we will think Chriſts judgement in ſuch caſes equal with our own.

But leſt all this ſhould be thought but a meer outward act of Chriſts, that carried nothing of any inward deſign of grace, he bleſſed them after all, as the fulleſt expreſſion of his heart; and to demonſtrate, that whatever grace he had ſhould be theirs as others: for ſo the word, ἐυλόγει α'υτὰ, ſignifies, either to ſpeak well of, or to any concerning perſons or things: and thus Chriſt may be thought to ſpeak much of the ſtate and priviledges of theſe Infants; or elſe to bleſs them, by deſiring for them, or communicating to them all ſorts of mercies, as bleſſings; according to that *Eph.* 1.3. And what can be more than for Chriſt to take up Infants in his arms, lay his hands on them, as an outward ſign, to conſecrate them to himſelf, and to ſhew their capacity of receiving the holy Ghoſt, and then to bleſſe them; which comprehends the communication of all graces, and all good things? And yet we muſt with ſcorn (poor probable Diſciples our ſelves) deny them a little

little water; and think it too much to have them named among the loweſt ſort of viſible Saints, when Chriſt owns them publickly, and ſaith, that *of ſuch as theſe is the Kingdome of God*; and they may have more intereſt in that Kingdome, than theſe that exclude them: but I ſhall rather believe Chriſts teſtimony, than any mans froward opinion: Its only a wonder how Saints, that have felt Chriſts bowels themſelves, and read this Text, can be ſo rigid to Infants of Believers, to whom Chriſt hath been ſo kinde, and exemplary in his carriages; and ſtampt ſuch viſible characters of his love on, even in adminiſtration of outward ſigns. To what end ſhould Chriſt do all this in ſuch a high and peremptory ſtrain of affection, if it were not to teach us charity and reſpect to Infants, in theſe ordinary adminiſtrations they are capable of; and to confirm their old ſtate in the Church, by ſuch a new and unwonted carriage; Chriſt abounding to them who were moſt undervalued, and could ſay nothing for themſelves? And how harſh is it to conceive, that Chriſts intent was hereafter to caſt them out of the viſible Church & from the participation of all outward ſigns of ſalvation, when his carriage was thus tranſcendently loving to them; and ſo only to give them a lightning before death? Let mens conſciences, not gulph'd in prejudice, judge: This Text, if there were no more, will fly in the Conſciences one day of the moſt confident Contemners of Infants, and their Baptiſm.

I

I ſhall onely add; to ſatisfie the learned, the conſent of godly and eminent Authors on this Scripture.

Non eſt ulla hiſtoria in toto codice Evangelico, quæ frequentius in Templo legatur, quam hæc ipſa. Quoties enim Infans ad ſacrum baptiſmatis fontem affertur, toties etiam ex agendis Eccleſiaſticis hæc hiſtoria recitatur; ſed admodum raro eadem in Eccleſia recitatur. Chemnitius & Polycarpus, Lyſerus in Harm. Evang.

And doubtleſſe it's no ordinary note, that three of the Evangeliſts ſhould ſo punctually relate this ſtory without any conſiderable change of words or ſenſe. All the Objection is, becauſe the word *Baptiſm* is not inſerted, when as much as that comes to is; and that Chriſt baptized no grown perſons.

Hinc jam illud eſt quod dixiſſe Dominum omnes ita memorant, talium enim eſt regnum Cœlorum. Non ſanè adultorum tantum, qui ut Infantes ſeſe humiliârunt quod Anabaptiſtæ contendunt. Hoc enim ſenſu quod dixerat ſibi Infantes afferendos eſſe, tanquam ſubjecta ratio minimè cohæreret, &c. Faceſſat igitur ſtulta iſta veſtra ſapientia; Sinite Infantes mihi adduci, aio enim non ſolum horum eſſe Regnum Cœlorum; ſed nullum omnino Regni hujus fore participem, niſi Infantibus his ſimilis evadat.

Si jam ad Eccleſiam pertinent, & ipſorum eſt Regnum Cœlorum, cur eis ſignum Baptiſmi, quo in Eccleſiam Chriſti, qui ad eam pertinent, recipi ſolent, negaremus? Siqui hœdi inter eos ſunt, tum excludendi nobis erunt, cum id eſſe ſeſe prodiderunt? interea ne ſimus ſeveriores Chriſto ——— aut eſt noſtrum baptizare pluſquam Domini

Domini amplecti, imponere manus & benedicere fuit? quæ fidei aut charitatis jactura, per Baptiſmum Chriſto adducere quos adduci ſibi juſſit?

Much more than this hath *Bucer* on *Mat* 19.13, 14, 15. full of ſpiritual conſideration.

To this doth *Muſculus*, *Calvin*, *Beza* add their holy Teſtimonies: But I ſpare theſe quotations, becauſe it's *ad homines*, to men like our ſelves: Let theſe which diſſent read impartially, and conſider if this place ſhould ſtand alone, without any harmony of other Scriptures, whether there be not more in it for infant-baptiſm, than any thing they have againſt it: I would be ſo ingenious with them, as to deal with any of their awaked Conſciences.

CHAP. XI.

Wherein is conſidered the method of God in the Old Teſtament, of adminiſtring Ordinances in Families, and baptizing Houſholds in the New-Teſtament; and how far it contributes to Infant-baptiſm.

IT's not a ſlight thing to conſider, how that ever ſince the Fall this hath been an uſual method of God in adminiſtration of the Covenant, and priviledges of grace, to make it run through families and houſhoulds of Believers, as the ſpecial veins; Hence families, as they were the firſt natural ſocieties,

ſo

ſo they were the firſt Churches, the Covenant and the priviledges of it was among them; from *Adam* to *Abraham* it went on thus: And when the Covenant in *Abrahams* time came to be more expreſly opened, and fairer expounded, God goes on ſtill in the ſame method, makes the Covenant with *Abraham* and his houſhold; only the family was enlarged, it became a greater houſhold, according to the vaſtneſſe of the extent of the Covenant; yet ſtill it was diſpenſed as to a family. Now if you come to the New Teſtament, there you ſee God going on in the ſame method, as if he had caſt by an eternal decree this platform: Baptiſm, the New Teſtament Ordinance, is adminiſtred according to the ſame deſign to families and houſholds. Let us conſider what Chriſt himſelf ſaith to *Zacheus*, *Luke* 19. who was a Gentile, and one of the chief Publicans, upon occaſion of this mans converſion, to open the nature and continuance of the Covenant to the Gentiles in the ſame form as it was to *Abraham*; *This day is ſalvation come to thy houſe, for as much as he alſo is a ſon of* Abraham: Here is the ſame language uſed in adminiſtration of Circumciſion in the Old Teſtament: and the ſame reaſon, *for aſmuch as he alſo* (καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς ὑὸς Ἀβραὰμ ἐστιν) *is a ſon of* Abraham. What can be drawn from this place more proper than theſe concluſions?

1. That as ſoon as ever he was converted and believed, Chriſt applies the promiſe to his houſe; if there were not ſomething more in it, he would have

have onely ſaid, *Salvation is come to thee.*

2. It's clear that he opens the Covenant made with *Abraham*; not onely to himſelf, but his houſe; and argues from his being a ſon of *Abraham*, that therefore the Covenant is not onely made with him, but with his houſe, that is, his ſeed: it were enough for to call him the ſon of *Abraham*, and to ſay, ſalvation is come to himſelf: but to mention his houſe, together with himſelf, and give this as a reaſon, becauſe he is the ſon of *Abraham*, is as much as to ſay, the priviledges of the Covenant is the ſame to you and your houſe, as it was to *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, *foraſmuch as he alſo is a ſon of* Abraham, *aſwell as they*. Now for Chriſt to ſpeak in this dialect, & to tell them of their houſholds, and of favour to them in the beginning of the Goſpel, and yet at the ſame time exclude their Infants from all outward ſigns of the promiſe, which they ever had in the darkeſt days of grace, is a ſtrange policy, unſutable to the ſimplicity of Jeſus Chriſt.

Concerning this continued method of God, though this *Zacheus* be a ſingular, yet he is not the onely example, if you read all along the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; theſe which had houſholds, the promiſe runs with a gracious entail, *Acts* 11. 14. *Cornelius* hath the promiſe to him and his houſe. *Acts* 16 15. *Lydia* was baptized, and her houſhold. Ver. 31. the Apoſtle exhorts the Jaylor to believe; and he ſhould be ſaved, and his whole houſe; Juſt as God made the Covenant with *Abraham*, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect*, Gen. 17. 1, 2, 7. *And I will be a God to thee,*

 and

and thy ſeed,or houſhol d. In ver.33. its ſaid,he was baptized,and all his (*ἀυτος καὶ οἱ ἀυτοῦ*) *he and all that were of him*; a moſt emphatical expreſſion to ſet forth his Children, who are the naturall off ſpring, and who are properly a mans own; he changes the general phraſe of a houſe, which may ſometimes comprehend more, and comes more cloſe home: when he ſaith,he was baptized,he ſaith,all his(*ἀυτοῦ*) of him, which cannot be meant of ſervants, who are our own as goods and lands are, but not of *a man*: but muſt firſtly and primarily refer to his Children, who are begotten of him;and it may be ſecondarily to his kindred; in the ſame phraſe you have it tranſlated, *Rom.*16 10,11. *The Houſhold of* Ariſtobulos, *the houſhold of* Narciſſus: but it is, *τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου, καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου*; *Theſe of* Ariſtobulus *and* Narciſſus: which muſt eſpecially be meant of their Children, and theſe that deſcended from their loins.

The onely Objection is from the following v.34. where it is ſaid, *That the Jaylor believed with all his houſe*; and ſo none were baptized but believers.

To which I anſwer, That is not a reſtriction or exception of all that were baptized, but a deſcription of the power the Word had upon all his houſe with himſelf; for he ſaid in the former verſe,that he was baptized,and with his thoſe which were begotten of him; and in this verſe he ſhews the actual influence of the Word on all his houſe likewiſe: So that the words are an after deſcription of the mighty work-

workings of the Goſpel,not onely to himſelf, who was baptized and ſo his; but on all his houſe beſides.

2. Others, and men of good account, do relate *πανόικοι, with all his houſe*,to the Jaylors rejoycing, not to his believing; and ſo read,thus, *And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them, and rejoyced, believing God, with all his houſe*; And it may be as well referred to the one as to the other.

However its very obſervable, That when he ſpeaks of the Apoſtles preaching, and their believing, he names his houſe in the largeſt term; v 32. *They preached the Word to him,and all that were*(*ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἀυτοῦ*) *to all that were in his houſe*: But when he ſpeaks of baptizing, he ſaith (that you may be ſure his Children were baptized) *that he, and all of him*, or *all his, were baptized*. Now he doth not ſay, *all that believed*, *but all* his *were baptized*: though there is no doubt but all that believed were baptized alſo.

But if there were no ſuch emphaticall expreſſion, as is by the holy Ghoſt in the baptizing of the Jaylors houſe; yet there is enough to make forth an example of Infant-baptiſm from the very notion of baptizing whole houſholds, ſo frequent in the Goſpell.

1. It will be very ſtrange confidence to affirm that in all theſe houſes there were no Infants, or little Children.

 2. There

2. There is greater probability, and ſtronger grounds to believe, when he names houſholds, that there were little ones in them, than that there were not.

3. Eſpecially when the word, *houſe*, in all languages in the world is moſt uſually put for Children of the houſe, who maintain and keep it up: and ſo often in Scripture, *Gen.* 30.30. and 45.18,19. *N.* 3.15. *Pſal.* 115.12,13. 1 *Tim.* 5.8.

4. Where whole houſes are baptized, there Infants are not excluded, if they be in the houſe; and if not excluded, they are included; they cannot be excluded, for they are principal parts of the houſe; and if onely *adulti*, or grown perſons ſhould be meant, when Children are named, that would be to exclude Infants from being Children, as well as from being parts of the houſhold.

When *Abraham* and his houſe were circumciſed, *Abrahams* Children were the principal parts of the houſe; and they were firſt circumciſed, and then his ſervants, and all in his houſhold were circumciſed alſo, being profeſſors of the ſame faith; for *Abraham* had a godly family: Yet upon a different account; the one by vertue of *Abrahams* Covenant, which was made primarily with him and his Children, with all his family likewiſe, as they profeſt *Abrahams* faith, and ſerved *Abrahams* God; and ſo it may be eaſily conceived how whole houſholds were baptized in the new Teſtament, the Children as in the Fathers Covenant; the Servants and others by vertue

vertue of the ſame profeſſion: And in this ſenſe there will be no ambiguity in the phraſe of baptizing whole houſholds.

Laſtly, That the Apoſtle ſhould borrow an expreſſion alwaies uſed in the Old Teſtament to include Children eſpecially, and make uſe of it in the New to exclude them, would be ſtrange but to conjecture: Now when ever the houſhold is ſpoken of in the Old Teſtament, it alwaies includes Children. This is ſtill more for the baptizing of Infants, than any thing they can ſay againſt it; and compared with all the former Scriptures, may make up a full demonſtration to a judicious conſcience.

CHAP. XII.

Circumciſion and Baptiſm compared; that they have both one ſpiritual ſignification; the true nature of them both opened, and what influence this conſideration hath to prove Infant-Baptiſm.

IT'S well known among theſe that are againſt baptizing of Infants, what weight they put on that Ordinance of Baptiſm; that all other ſeem light in their eyes, and of no account in reſpect of that. When they ſpeak of Circumciſion, they uſually call that a carnal Ordinance, ſealing onely carnal and temporary things, and onely reaching the outward man; the one requiring onely the fleſh for its ſubject, the other a ſpiritual man, a new creature, &c. And ſo much

much do they idolize(for ſo I fear its among many) Baptiſm,that even faith it ſelf ſeems little without it: But that I may waſh off this paint, and make Ordinances look like themſelves,let us compare theſe ordinances together, and view them in their dignity, and worth, and ſignifications. And,

1. In general for Circumciſion; we all know how much it was prized among the Jews above all other Ordinances, and that it was the laſt that was taken away with the greateſt difficulty;about which the Apoſtles had more ado, than about the taking away all the Ceremonies; wherely we may judge, the Jews did look on it as the great ſeal of all their priviledges; which when that was loſt, all was loſt. Read the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, chap. 2,3. when he would ſpeak all their outward priviledges at once, he ſaith, *What advantage hath a Jew? what profit of Circumciſion, &c?* So in the *Galathians*, *Philippians*, *Epheſians*, *Coloſſians*, many chapters are ſpent to take them off from Circumciſion.

2. Circumciſion was that Ordinance which was immediately annexed to the Covenant, and a confirmation of it, *Gen.*17. 7, 10. therefore called the Covenant.

3. It was an ordinance inſtituted long before the Legal and Moſaical Ceremonies of an elder date: It was not a type of *Canaan*, but of Chriſt to come in the fleſh of the ſeed of *Abraham*, and of the circumciſion of the heart, which Chriſt was moſt fully to perfect in the Goſpel.

There

There is only one Gentleman that writ a Book of Baptiſm, printed in the year 1646. will have Circumciſion to be a type of Baptiſm,which cannot be: For,

1. Types muſt have ſomething in their outward face to repreſent another thing more eminent and real: Now Circumciſion hath nothing in the outſide to ſet forth Baptiſm.

2. It is not ſo handſom to make one outward ſign the antitype of another.

4 Circumciſion was as holy an Ordinance as Baptiſm in the New Teſtament; for they are both in themſelves outward acts and no holineſs more in one than in another, but as they have from inſtitution: onely Baptiſm is more eaſie to the fleſh than Circumciſion; and yet not more eaſie,if that way of dipping ſhould be the onely way of baptizing, eſpecially at ſome ſeaſons,and to ſome bodies.

5. The N.T. gives as large and honourable characters of Circumciſion,as it doth of Baptiſm: thus the Apoſtle calls it in *Rom.*4. *The ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*: A character ſo reſplendent and glorious, that the Goſpel can give no higher to an Ordinance. And as much as he ſaith of Baptiſm in effect. 1 *Pet.*3 21. that baptiſm ſaves through the anſwer of a good conſcience, the contrary opinioniſts are put to hard ſhifts to avoid the ſtrength of this place; and therefore ſome would evade it thus, ſaying,That the Apoſtle doth not call it a ſeal of the Covenant or Promiſe, but of the righteouſneſſe of faith.

Sol. A miſerable evaſion! as if the righteouſneſs of faith were not included in the Covenant, or there were any righteouſneſs of faith but what comes by the Covenant, and ſo would make a ſeparation between the promiſe of righteouſneſs, and the righteouſneſs promiſed.

Others would cloath the Text with this diſguize, That it ſealed it onely to *Abraham*, whereas it was ſo to *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and *David*, and all that were in the Covenant.

This is held forth moſt clearly in that verſe.

1. That Circumciſion was a ſeal of the pure Covenant of grace, in which righteouſneſs was promiſed to *Abraham* and his ſeed indefinitely.

2. That this ſeal was applied to all the ſeed that were but externally and viſibly in Covenant, to Infants; and the ſame ſign that *Abraham* received upon profeſſion of his faith, his Child received; and therefore he is ſaid to be the Father of Circumciſion as of Faith; ver. 12.

3. Doctor *Willet* from this place holds forth the ſameneſs of the ſubſtance of the Sacraments of the Old and New Teſtament, both which do ſeal the righteonuſneſs of faith; and lays it as a great error on the Romaniſts, who affirm, That the Old Teſtament Sacraments did not exhibit the graces of the New.

4. This cannot be denied from the place, without men will willfully put out their own eyes, that Circumciſion had as glorious a uſe as Baptiſm, *viz.* to

ſeal the righteouſneſs of faith; which muſt be aſwell to others that had the true efficacy of the Covenant, as to *Abraham* himſelf; and no higher mercy can any ordinance of the New Teſtament ſeal to any.

There were many other circumſtantiall and accidental uſes of circumciſion according to the Jewiſh ſtate, as we will grant Mr. *Tombes*, as,

1. To engage to the performance of the whole Law, *Gal.* 5.2,3. *Acts* 15.10.

2. To be a partition wall between Jew and Gentile, *Eph* 2.14.

But when the Apoſtle would give circumciſion his true character, and ſhew what the primary, and ſubſtantial uſe of it was, he calls it a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith

6. Circumciſion and baptiſm ſignifie one and the ſame thing, and ſo agree in being ſigns of the ſame grace; compare *Coloſ.* 2.11,12,13. with *Rom.* 6.3-4. and 6. ver. circumciſion ſignifies the putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh; baptiſm is into Chriſts death, and to teſtifie the crucifying the old man with him, that the body of death might be deſtroyed, as by the comparing theſe two places it is moſt clear; and 3 v. and 6.v. of *Rom* 6. chap. onely baptiſm hath this larger conſideration in it, as that it takes in Chriſts reſurrection with it, and alſo the quickning of the ſoul together with him, which was not ſo fully ſignified in Circumciſion, but implied, according as the Apoſtle argues in the ſame place, *Rom.* 6.v.5. for if we have been planted in the likeneſs of his death,

we ſhall be alſo in the likenes of his reſurrection; the one being a conſequence of the other; and as circumciſion did cut off the foreskin in token of the deſtruction of ſin, ſo baptiſm by waſhing, ſignifies the taking away the pollution of ſin; thus God when he would promiſe to kill ſin and work all grace, he expreſſeth it by circumciſion; *I will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed.* Deut. 30.6. And the Apoſtle *Phil* 3.4 ſaith, *We are of the circumciſion*, that is, we have the true work of grace in us.

The reaſon why I urge theſe conſiderations, is to hold for the capacity of Infants, as well for baptiſm as circumciſion; there is no reaſon why they ſhould be thought more unfit and incapable for the one than for the other: For,

First if Circumciſion were a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, and yet applied to Infants, and baptiſm can ſeal no higher mercy, why ſhould it be thought ſuch a ſtrange and unmeet thing to baptize them, more than to circumciſe them? they uſually ſay you put a ſeal to a blank in baptizing Infants; the ſame might be ſaid as to circumciſion; yet they were circumciſed as well as *Abraham* that profeſt his own Faith. I muſt acknowledge I never could yet underſtand why Infants ſhould be thought fit to have that ſeal applied to them in the Old Teſtament, which the New calls a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of Faith, and yet be denyed it in the New Teſtament as incapacious, when Baptiſm can ſeal no more. I wiſh it were ſeriouſly conſidered;

Eſpecially

Eſpecially, Secondly, when Baptiſm ſhall ſignifie the ſame thing in ſubſtance, be both ſigns of the ſame grace; the one cutting away ſin as with a knife, the other waſhing it away with water; and yet Infants capable, and moſt fit to have the adminiſtration of the one ordinance, not of the other; if theſe of the diſſenting judgment, did with more ſobriety weigh ſuch conſiderations as theſe, they would not with ſo much fooliſh contempt write and ſpeak of Infants Baptiſm.

A knife may be applyed to an Infant, as to *Abraham*, though old, and in the height of his Faith, and ſeal the righteouſneſs of it; but water muſt onely be poured on actuall believers, and grown perſons, ſuch as *Abraham*, but not on Infants, though it hath no more to ſeal; as if there were ſome ſtrange excellency and vertue in the nature of water, that it were too precious to waſh the Infants of believers: For, if there be no more virtue in the water that baptizeth, then in the knife that circumciſed, you ſee there is no more glorious uſe of the one than the other. And what end God ſhould have to put ſuch a ſeal on Infants in the Old Teſtament, and exclude them in the New, when the Ordinances both ſignifie the ſame ſubſtantial grace, let any Chriſtian heart imagine.

CHAP. XIII.

That famous place, Colos. 2. 11, 12. *opened: the correspondence between Circumcision and Baptism further cleared.*

THe scope of the Apostle in the former verses is to disswade the Christians from Jewish ceremonies, especially from Circumcision; and he doth it especially from the discovery of Christs fulness, and our being compleat in him; that is, you need nothing out of Christ now; but they object, we want Circumcision; he tells them they are circumcised in him, 11. v. where the Apostle distinguisheth of a twofold circumcision; one χειροποίητος, made with hands, the other ἀχειροποίητος, made without hands, which he calls the circumcision of Christ, but it is wrought by him, and is by union with him; and you being circumcised in Christ, and have the grace signified by outward circumcision, you need no more; but there be two things they might object:

First, that this is nothing to the question: you would take us off from outward circumcision, by telling us we are inwardly circumcised, whereas the sign and the thing signified should alwaies go together: *Abraham* had this circumcision and others, and yet were outwardly circumcised.

Secondly, they might object we are not so compleat in Christ as *Abraham* and his seed; for, besides the inward grace, they had an outward sign and seal to confirm it to them.

The

The Apostle in the 12. ver. answers both at once, they were not onely circumcised inwardly, with Christs circumcision, but there was an outward sign in the New Testament to be applied to them, of the same consideration; Buried with him in Baptism, &c. This is the summe of the words, let us now consider what may be fairly deducted from them.

Many, and the most of our Divines, do conclude from hence the succession of Baptism in the place or room of Circumcision, that this Ordinance is appointed in the new Testament in lieu of the former, and for the same ends and purposes; which doubtless is true from this place, if men would truly weigh the import of the words, and not fight with their own shadows.

First this compleatness in Christ is as well to enjoyment of Ordinances, and outward priviledges, as inward graces; else he would never have mentioned Baptism outwardly, when in the former verse he speaks of inward circumcision; he would have kept still in that strain.

Secondly observe how he joyns them together, and makes them one, the inward circumcision confirmed by the outward baptism, circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism; now this could not be proper, nor of any possible connexion, but by putting the outward sign of baptism instead of the outward sign of circumcision; that is, you are circumcised because baptised; you change but the outward element, or instrument;

but

but the ſame inward grace is confirmed by both; thus the words are legible, and to be underſtood, without difficulty; but any other interpretation will be found moſt rugged, and unſuitable: For,

Thirdly, as the Apoſtle could not ſay in the former v. that they were circumciſed in Chriſt, but from the analogy between the outward ſign, and the inward grace; that is, if the outward ſign of circumciſion had not ſignified ſuch an inward work; ſo neither could he have found they were circumciſed in Chriſt, being buried with him in baptiſm, if that Ordinance of baptiſm did not as an outward ſign anſwer to that inward Circumciſion, and were inſtead of that ſign which did directly repreſent it formerly.

Fourthly the nature of the Apoſtles deſign holds out this; for he would take them off the practiſe of circumciſion; and this he doth by diſcovering of another Ordinance, more ſuitable to the Goſpel, which ſhould ſignifie the ſame thing unto them, in a more large and emphaticall manner, ſignifying not onely Chriſts death, but his reſurrection; ſo that in the very import of the phraſe he cals baptiſm a Goſpel-circumciſion; and this argument he urgeth as moſt effectuall to take them off Circumciſion, by ſhewing them they were compleat in Chriſt in the New Teſtament, as to inward graces, and outward Ordinances, for though they were not circumciſed, they had baptiſm to ſupply the want of it with advantage, ſo that they ſhould not loſe an Ordinance, but exchange. *In whom you are circumciſed*, &c. *buried*

buried with him in baptiſme; if baptiſm did not ſeal and confirm the inward Circumciſion, it could not be ſaid *Circumciſed in Chriſt*, *being buried with him in baptiſm*, and baptiſm could not ſeal inward circumciſion, but as it was of the ſame uſe with outward circumciſion, which did moſt directly ſignifie the circumciſion of the heart; and baptiſm held the ſame analogy, and was inſtituted to the ſame end; therefore its called the waſhing of regeneration. Suppoſe the Ordinance ſhould again be changed, and inverſion ſhould be thus, That baptiſm ſhould be abolliſhed, and circumciſion ſet up again, and the Apoſtle ſhould expreſſe himſelf after the ſame manner; intending to take them off the uſe of baptiſm, and to be circumciſed; and ſay ye are compleat in Chriſt, in whom ye are alſo baptized with the baptiſm of Chriſt, being circumciſed with him; would not the deduction be clear, that circumciſion was ordained inſtead of baptiſm, and to ſupply the defect of that Ordinance? the ſame concluſion muſt be according to the words as from circumciſion to baptiſm.

The ſumme of all is, That as inward circumciſion was ſignified by the outward circumciſion; the circumciſion made without hands, by the circumciſion with hands, as the proper and direct ſign of it; ſo is that inward circumciſion, as really and fully ſignified and confirmed by baptiſm: and that Ordinance is appointed to repreſent & ſeal that, as the outward act of circumciſion was formerly: ſo that circumciſion & baptiſm,

baptiſm, as to the thing ſignified, and the inward intent of their uſe, are made all one: elſe it will be very hard to make ſenſe of this place of Scripture.

The Pleas againſt this interpretation are of little worth, if weighed; ſome ſay its onely meant of the inward circumciſion, and inward baptiſm, which interpretation will ſerve us better than themſelves; for if inward graces, and of the ſame ſubſtantiall work be done on us, as circumciſed and baptized in Chriſt, it ſhews the oneneſs of the outward ſigns in the ſame ſignification.

Mr. *Tombes* ſaith in his *Examen*. p 93 That there is an analogy between circumciſion and baptiſm: yet ſaith it is rather between circumciſion and Chriſts burial, than between circumciſion and baptiſm, as *Chryſoſtom*, and after him *Theophylact* on the place.

All which will ſtill make out the truth of our interpretation; For,

Firſt, if there be an analogie between them, as is, and muſt be granted, then there is ſome proportion and agreement between theſe two Ordinances; now its not in the outward adminiſtration, nor the external ſign, in that there is no proportion between a knife and water; and therefore it muſt be in the proper ſignification and reall uſe, which is the Apoſtles ſcope in this place: and therefore he expreſſeth the inward grace properly ſignified by the one Ordinance, and yet confirmed by the other; *Circumciſed in him, being buried with him in Baptiſm.*

2. If the analogy be between Circumciſion and Chriſts

Chriſts burial, not between it and Baptiſm, yet it will come all to one, yea, be our advantage: For

1. That ſhews that Circumciſion did hold forth as much as Baptiſm, *viz.* Chriſts death and burial.

2. That when we are ſaid to be buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, & that is the outward ſign to repreſent our burial with Chriſt, we are as if we were circumciſed; Circumciſion holds analogy with Chriſts burial, and ſo doth Baptiſm with both: And thus take it in what ſenſe you will, the Text will clear it ſelf.

CHAP. XIV.

A clear Explication of Mat. 28.19. *With* Mar. 16.15, 16. *wherein their argument from the firſt inſtitution is opened and confuted.*

LEt us at length come to view that prime Text, *Matth.* 28.19. on which theſe that are againſt Infant-baptiſm lay the moſt weight. As from the very firſt inſtitution of that Ordinance, Chriſt gives his Apoſtles there Commiſſion to teach and baptize; *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the father, Son and holy Ghoſt.* Hence (μαθητεύσατε) which they tranſlate, Diſciple all Nations, and then baptize them, they argue, None are to be baptized by Chriſts inſtitution, but theſe which are firſt taught, and ſo made diſciples: But Infants are not capable to be taught, or to be made Diſciples. *Ergo.* They may not be baptized.

That I may ſhew the errors of this argument, and ſo fully clear up the point, the terms with their connexion both in the major and minor propoſition muſt be examined from the words of the Text, and that parallel place, *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. which for methods ſake I ſhall hold forth in theſe following conſiderations.

1. For the word μαθητεύσατε, we ſhall not much ſtand on, whether it be tranſlated to make Diſciples, or as it is in our common verſion, *Go teach all Nations*; for it is ſometimes a verb tranſitive; to teach by writing, or *viva voce*, with a living voice; and ſo it is to be taken here, ſaith learned *Whitaker De Script.* and moſt agreeable with *Mark* 16. 15. where he bids them *Go preach the Goſpell to every Creature.*

2. The ſtrength of the argument lies (if there be any ſtrength in it) on the abſolute ſuppoſed connexion between diſcipling and being baptized; therefore they ſay, None but theſe which are capable of teaching, are capable of Baptiſm; which is *Fallacia à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*, a Fallacy to take that abſolutely which is meant onely according to ſome reſpect. But to ſhew the idleneſs of the connexion;

1. You find preaching or teaching the Goſpel to be ſeparated as to the adminiſtration, and neceſſary and immediate connexion, by *Paul* himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17 *Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel*; ſo he ſaith in the former verſes, *He taught many, baptized*

2. Compare this with *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. which expounds this, you will finde believing and being Baptized as cloſe connected to ſalvation, as here baptizing to Teach; *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* Now if any will ſtand on the order of words to prove an inſtitution, we may as well argue from *Mark*, as they from *Matthew*; None muſt be baptized but theſe which are taught; ſo none that believeth, and is not baptized, can be ſaved; and that baptiſm is as neceſſary to ſalvation as believing; for in order of phraſe they are abſolutely joyned together: And what a ſtrange inference would that be to make Baptiſm equall with Faith to ſalvation? and yet we have as much ground to argue from the one place ſo, as they from the other; without they will admit ſome other qualifying term to make it up.

3. The order of things is not always, or commonly ſo exactly expreſt in Scripture by the poſition of the words; for ſometimes one thing in the order of words is put before another, which in order of nature and conſideration is antecedent to it; as *Mar.* 1. 15 Repentance is put before Faith, *Rom.* 10. 9. Confeſſion with the mouth is put before believing with the heart, as to ſalvation; with abundance of other places of Scripture. Thus many things in the Evangeliſts are left out by one, ſupplied by another; and the ſame word directly uttered in one, inverted in another, eſpecially about the adminiſtration of the

Lords Supper. For to avoyd tediouſneſs, conſult the places your ſelves. *Mat.* 26.26, 27. *Mar.* 14. 22, 23. *Luk.* 22.20. 1 *Cor.* 11.25.

3. A third conſideration to open this Text in *Matthew*, is from comparing it once more with its parallel, *Mar.* 16.15. there it is, *Go preach the Goſpel*, here it is *Teach and baptize*: Now hence it follows, that their teaching was by holding forth the Goſpel: As much as if he had ſaid, Open the Covenant, tel men the riches and fulneſs of grace: Now if they muſt teach the Goſpel, they muſt needs inſtruct them in the Covenant, which was to theſe that believed, and their ſeed. Now ſutable to this Commiſſion, *Peter*, when he comes to open the Goſpel to the Jews pricked in their hearts, preſently holds out the promiſe to them and their children, *Acts* 2.38, 39. and by that to make them both Diſciples. So *Gal.* 3.13. The bleſſings of *Abraham* to come on the Gentiles, is one of the main parts of the Goſpel. Now if they teach men Goſpel, they muſt preach, as *Peter* did when he had converted the Parent, *The promiſe is to you and to your Children.* Thus in *Luk.* 1. 72. this is made one great end of Chriſts coming, *to perform the mercy promiſed to our Fathers, and to remember his holy Covenant*; ſo that preaching the Goſpel is preaching the Covenant. Now that Infants are in the Covenant as well as grown perſons, we have formerly proved.

4. This is no more than was required of *Abraham* at the time of Circumciſion, and yet his Infants were not

not excluded from the Ordinance. *Gen.* 17. *walke before me, and be perfect Chap.* 18. 19. *Abraham* was to command his Children, and teach them to keep the ways of the *Lord*: and yet his Children were not to be kept from the ſign of the Covenant, until they were taught, & had walked before God in uprightneſs, as *Abraham*.

5. To come home to the word, in their own ſenſe, μαθητεύσατε ſignifies *Make diſciples*; now Children are not capable of being made Diſciples, ſay they.

I anſwer, 1. Some have been made Diſciples before they were diſtinctly taught, as the twelve, whom Chriſt called, and they followed him, & became his Diſciples, and were real Diſciples, yet as ignorant as Infants, and were taught afterwards by degrees.

2. One is ſaid to be made a Diſciple even in vulgar phraſe, as well who is lifted in the School to be taught, as one that is teaching or already taught, though he hath not learnt a letter: Thus in all Schools it's a uſual phraſe at the firſt entrance of a Child, he is called a new Scholar, or a new Diſciple Thus Infants being entred into Chriſts School, and given up to be taught in time, and by degrees, may be accounted Diſciples; it was ſo in the former inſtance, & it's no ſtrange expreſſion in civil *Schools*.

3. Infants are expreſly called Diſciples in the New Teſtament, as well as grown and taught men: Thus *Acts* 15.10. Circumciſion is called a yoke put on the neck of the *Diſciples*, that is, on Infants, who were

the ſpecial ſubject of that Ordinance, and bore the burthen of it, and not properly the Parents; and yet the Parents had the deep ſenſe of it reflecting on themſelves and their little ones, and therefore he calls it a yoke that they nor their Fathers were able to bear; eſpecially becauſe it did binde them and their children to keep the whole law; there is no evaſion of this; if they ſay it was meant of the Fathers and of the doctrine of circumciſion, which did bind themſelves: yet they muſt grant the yoke was on their Children as to the act; and that if the doctrine was ſo burdenſome, much more the practice, which the poor Infants are under; and they are called indefinitely *Diſciples*, either by themſelves, or with their Parents; and the argument is thus: Thoſe were Diſciples on whom the yoke of circumciſion was laid but on Infants was this yoke laid. *Ergo* Infants are Diſciples in the N. T. expreſſion. If you will make any diſtinction it muſt be in the manner of laying on the yoke, *viz.* on the Parents doctrinally, on the Children actually: but there can be no reſtriction of the word, *Diſciples*. from theſe on whom that yoke was laid, as is expreſt in that Chapter. Conſider,

4. Let us come to the ſubjects to whom the Goſpel is to be preached. and they taught and baptized; it is in *Matthew*, παντὰ τὰ ἔθνη, *all Nations*; *in Mark* it is, *Preach the Goſpell*, πάσῃ κτίσει, *to every Creature*: Now that Infants ſhould be none of all the Nations, and excluded from being of this creation of God, who were included as ſpeciall ſubjects

whe

when the Church was in but ſo ſmall a ſpot of the world, is from our narrow apprehenſions in the Goſpel-times of diſpenſation of Grace.

And the argument our Divines bring from this place is ſtrong and moſt conſiderable: The Goſpel is to be preached to every Creature, all Nations muſt be diſcipled; but Infants are a part of this creation, are included in all Nations; therefore they muſt be made diſciples alſo. Read the Text again, *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations* (παντὰ τὰ ἔθνη) *baptizing them* (ἀυτὰς) which muſt needs refer to (τὰ ἔθνη) though the one be maſculine, the other the neuter; or elſe muſt relate to nothing, for it hath no Relative beſides to anſwer unto: This is very common in Scripture, and the ſame phraſes, as thoſe well know that underſtand the Greek in *Rev.* 2. 26, 27. *Chap.* 19:15. there is ἔθνη with ἀυτὰς, as Mr. *Cobbet* of *N. E.* well obſerves. Conſult *Acts* 15. 17. and 26. 17. *Acts* 21. 25. *Eph.* 2. 11. Maſculines joyned with (ἔθνη) that ſignifies *all Nations*. Now are Infants none of the Nations, or none of the National creation which the Goſpel may reach? God forbid!

The words hold forth only the general commiſſion given to the Apoſtles after Chriſts death; which was an enlarging of their bounds, who were onely formerly circumſcribed in *Judea*, and charged not to go into the way of the Gentiles: But now the empale is broken down, they muſt preach the Goſpel to every creature, teach all Nations, and baptize them: but it doth not hold forth either the proper

ſubjects of baptiſm, or the form or manner of baptizing, which ſhould not be delivered (according to their own rule of inſtitutions) in general and indefinite terms, as, *Every creature, all Nations*; and by tranſitive words, as, *Preach the Goſpel to them, teach them.* If this be the prime inſtitution of baptizing, from which place they exclude Infants, when Chriſt uſeth ſuch univerſal and comprehenſive expreſſions; we ſhall deſire but to deal with them on their ground, and the ſame Text will ſerve to prove our poſitions more demonſtratively than theirs: And this Text ſhews, that Chriſt gave commiſſion to the Apoſtles and Miniſters to preach and baptize; but in what order to do it, or what ſhould be required to the qualification of the ſubject as abſolutely neceſſary, is not at all diſcovered in this Scripture; they muſt look for another Text to exclude Infants beſides this, elſe give up their confidence.

Either this place is the full and exact rule of inſtitution of baptizing, or not; if they ſay it is, then it would deſcribe the perſons, and the manner, the matter and the form of baptizing, and that in the uſual phraſe with other Scriptures: but here is only a general commiſſion to two great acts, *viz.* to preach, teach and baptize; and we may ſay in the ſame place, that whoever are outwardly taught, or do but hear the Goſpell (though they walk never ſo contrary) muſt be baptized; for the commiſſion is, Teach and Baptize, nothing of the parties entertainment of it is mentioned in this *Mat.* 28. nor of the

the qualification of the ſubject with any diſtinguiſhing character. If they ſay this doth not hold forth all the inſtitutions in every particular, as they muſt grant, then we may compare other Scriptures with this, to make out the full inſtitution, as theſe where Infants are mentioned with ſo much gracious conſideration, as hath been formerly expreſt.

CHAP. XV.

Concerning the ſignification and uſe of the word Baptiſm, *or to be baptized; the gennine Etymologie of it in the Old and New Teſtament; the places in the New Teſtament brought to prove it ſignifies to plunge the whole body, anſwered.*

THE confidence of theſe that differ hath been ſo great, that as they have excommunicated Infants from the capacity of ſuch a priviledge, which they had ſo old a title unto; ſo they have forced this only ſenſe from the word *to baptize*, that it muſt ſignifie to plunge the whole body under water; and deny that to be true Baptiſm, which is not ſo adminiſtred; and ſo make it as eſſential to the manner, as viſible profeſſion to the matter.

For clearing up of this miſt, I have diligently enquired into the propriety of the word, and its uſe in

the

the Greek Tranſlators of the Old and New Teſtament, which are the beſt guides in this caſe; and if we look narrowly, it will be very hard to find, & very ſeldome, that ever the word in Scripture is uſed for the total immerſion of the body, or being abſolutely under water.

The word (βαπτίζειν) ſignifies among all Writers both Heathen and Eccleſiaſtical, promiſcuouſly to dip into, or waſh with water, by pouring on of it, or ſprinkling; & there is nothing more uſual in the New Teſtament expreſſion of it, than to hold forth any kind of waſhing; It's expreſt in Authors by *madefactare, lavare, abluere*, to wet or waſh: thus *Budæus, Scapula, Paſor* and *Grotius* do interpret the word, though they grant it is, & may be taken more ſtrictly for immerſion: but let the Scripture explain it ſelf, *Mar.* 7.4. it is uſed for the waſhing of hands, and and of cups, and beds and brazen veſſels, and of tables; which is not by plunging them in the water, ſo much as waſhing them by the pouring forth of water on them; for ſo it is expreſt, when they came from the market they durſt not eat (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίζονται) without they were baptized, that is, waſhed; which could not be their whole bodies, without both exceſſive trouble and danger, for which times and ſeaſons muſt be obſerved: And beſides this (ſaith the Evangeliſt) they retained many other things in cuſtome, βαπτισμὸς ποτηρίων, &c. as the Baptiſm of cups; that is, *lotiones*, or the waſhing of cups; which may be as well done by pouring on water, as by plunging

plunging into water, & was and is uſually done in all Nations. So in *Luk.* 11.38. the Phariſes wondred at Jeſus (ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου) that he was not baptized before dinner, that is, did not waſh. And *Heb.* 9.10. all the Ceremonial waſhings or ſprinklings are called Baptiſms; in a metaphorical ſenſe it's uſed for the pouring forth of the ſpirit.

And further, when it is tranſlated to dip, both in the Old and New Teſtament, it ſignifies commonly the leaſt touch or taſt of any thing that is liquid. So *Luke* 16.24 *Dives* begs that *Lazarus* might be ſent (ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος) That he might baptize, or dip the top of his finger in water to cool his tongue; the leaſt drop would have been prized by him: 1 *Sam.* 14.27. *Jonathan* is ſaid to dip the end of his rod in an hony-comb, that is, but to take a very little; and the word is (ἀνέβαψε) ſo it is uſed in *Exod.* 12.22. *Job.* 13.26.

But to put it out of queſtion, that there needs no ſuch rigidneſs; and in preſſing this method of plunging, from the word *Baptiſm*, let us compare it with other phraſes. When the Scripture would expreſſe a covering of the whole body under water, and ſo a ſubmerſion, or being wholly under water, it uſeth two other words, as different from baptizing, *viz.* καταποντίζεσθαι, and δύνω and δύομαι. Compare 1 *Cor.* 10.2. All the Fathers and the Iſraelites are ſaid to be

Differt à δύνω, quod eſt profundum petere, & penitus ſubmergi. Paſor. Lexic.

be baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea; they had only the dewings of the Cloud,& the ſprinklings of the water on them as they paſt through: But in *Exod.* 15.4,5. when he ſpeaks of *Pharoah* and his Hoſt, he doth not ſay they were baptized in the warers, but uſeth theſe two words κατεπόντισεν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, *They were drowned in the Red Sea, ſubmerſi*; and he adds, *the depths have covered them*; and κατέδυσαν εἰς βύθον, ὥσει λίθος, *they ſank*, or as the word is, *douſed themſelves into the bottom as a ſtone, while the Iſraelites were but baptized under the gentle droppings of the Cloud, and of the Sea.* And the very ſame diſtinction did the Greek Writers make between baptizing, and douſing, or caſting under water; expreſſing by baptizing, to be in the water as a Bottle is, or Ship that is ſeldom or never wholly overwhelmed. And this appears moſt demonſtratively to be their meaning by the verſe of the Ancient Oracle of the *Athenians*, who well knew how to ſpeak and diſtinguiſh Greek.

> Ἀσκὸς βαπτίζη, σῶσα δέτοι ὁ θέμις ὄστι.
> Baptize *or waſh him*, utris inſtar, *as a Bottle in water, but do not drown him, or utterly plunge him.*

Whereby it plainly appears that the word (*to Baptize*) ſignifies any kind of waſhing, whether by ſprinkling or pouring out of water, or diping into water: & that it is ſpecially diſtinguiſhed from theſe words that do ſignifie a total ſubmerſion; and theſe men do rack the word only to ſpeak for plunging under

under water, excluding the uſual & more common ſenſe of it, which is to waſh or cleanſe.

But let us view the Scriptures which they bring for the maintenance of this ſignification, *Mat.*3.13.16, *Jeſus after he was baptized, went ſtraight wayes up out of the water,* (ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος) which may be tranſlated, *he went up from the waters*, ἀπὸ ſignifying more properly *ab* then *ex*, *from* than *out*; and it is moſt ſutable to tranſlate it ſo, becauſe all rivers, for moſt part, lie low, & in valleys, in coming to which we are ſaid to deſcend, & coming from to aſcend; thus when Chriſt aſcended, in *Act.*1.9. *He was taken out of their ſight, that is*, from their ſight.

Of the like conſideration is that other place, which they lay ſo much weight on for to hold forth plunging, *Act*8 36,37,38. of *Philip* & the Eunuch, it is ſaid they *went both down into the water* (εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ) which may as well, and better be tranſlated, *they went down to, or towards the water*; it ſeems they being on the upper ground, ſpied water below them, and ſo went down to it to be baptized, as it is a common phraſe among us, to go down to the water-ſide.

But ſecondly, ſhould we grant them this interpretation, that *they went both down into the water*, which is a ſtraining of the words, yet it can never be proved from this, that their whole body was dipt all over; a man may go into the water, & yet not be over his ſhoes; & how can they prove by this place they went in any further, or how far they went; or whether *Philip* did not take up water, & poured it on him; or whether

whether he duckt him under water, or dipt only his head; nothing can be proved from this place; but if they conjecture one thing, we may another, with as much evidence. In the 107. Psal. it is said, *They that go down to the sea in ships, see thy wonders*; when they go down into the sea in ships, is the ship plunged all over? or are they under water in the ship.

Yet thirdly, it is evident that their going into the water, is distinguished in the same ver. from the Eunuchs being baptized; they went down, or to (or according to their own mind) into the water, & he baptized him: so that the going into the water; take it for dipping & ducking, is not baptizing, but something distinct, another act; and if they will prove going down to the water, or into the water, in this place denotes the dipping of the whole body, then he must be dipt before he was baptized; for *Philip* baptized him after they went into the water.

Again, there is as much from this phrase to prove *Philip* to be dipt as the Eunuch; and if dipping be baptizing, for the text saith expressly, *they both went down to*, or *in the water*, if you interpret it after their own heart, that they both went into the water, *Philip* was as much in the water as the Eunuch; for there is no exception made, but both went in together, & who should then baptize the Eunuch? if this seem to be an absurdity to them, how can they from this expression, in the severest acception, conclude the Eunuch was dipt? but they both went into the water together, seeing the Text speaks as much of *Philips*

lips going into the water, as of the Eunuchs: But if we take it according to the first translation, that they went both down towards the water, there may be some reasonable account given how the one was baptized; which seems to be most propable, by pouring out water upon him.

If any one object further from the next verse, that they ascended out of the water, here is not (ἀπο as in the former place, but ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος) *out of the water* yet it will not at all help them; for it is said of them both, they came up out of the water, and it speaks as much of *Philips* dipping himself as the Eunuch; & you may as well argue that *Philip* was new dipt, as that the Eunuch was baptized by dipping, because they both came up out of the water; besides, one may be said very properly to come out of the water, if he put but his foot into it; and thus you see on what weak foundations these high structures of confidence and ridgidsnesse are built,

The third and most triumphant place, which they cry up, and adore for this manner of baptizing by dipping, is *John* 3. 23. *And John was baptizing in Ænon near to Salem, because there was much water there.*

If we consider impartially, here is but a Geographical description of this place, of its situation, nigh *Salem*, & of the benefit they had of water, in regard of the most places besides in the countrey, *Ænon* lying nigh the banks of *Jordan*; and whereas they

lay

lay the weight on this, that he gives it as a reason, why *John* was baptizing at *Ænon*, because there was much water there, it may be a very good reason why he chose that place for the country to come in, and be baptized, because they might go many a mile in these hot countries, and not meet with a drop of water, and it was a great priviledge accounted to these places that banked on *Jordan*, that they had much water; but what argument is this to prove that *John* plunged all he baptized?

The argument according to their form must be thus; *John* baptized in *Ænon*, because there was much water; *Ergo*, baptizing is by dipping all the whole body: this is a dangerous and ominous way of arguing to those that deny consequences, and deductions, for to warrant duties without expres syllabical precept; I hope they will allow us the same priviledge of demonstration, when we say, whole houses were baptized, *Ergo*, Infants and Children, who are the pillars of a house; is not this more fair and probable, than that *John* plunged their whol body, because there was much water? There is none of our consequences for Infants baptism so strained and far fet. ht, as we have demonstrated formerly; it was necessary for them that had so many of several parts to baptize, to go where there may be much water, when they could get hardly a drop many miles round about, and yet not immerse every one they bap.ized; you may in *England* go 20. miles in some countries, and not finde a river to plunge a mans whole body under

under the water, what would it be in *Spain*, & the other hot countreys, where water is sold as wine and beer with us, how far might they go ere they could get a rive. to plunge themselves in? Thus you see how litt'e reason they have from these scriptures to be so peremptory and rigid, as to make the essence of baptism to be dipping, or plunging all the body

The la pretence commonly urged for this dipping, is from the analogy it hath with Christs burial, from that *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in baptism*; hence say they, it is clear one must be dipt under water, else it will not represent a burial. In this they put all their confidence, and therefore let us seriously view heir strength.

Sol. First, let it be considered that they still make use of consequences, to prove institutions, which they will not allow us.

But more particularly, 1. Plunging the whole body into the water, doth not hold similitude neither with Christs burial, nor the manner of burials in the most part of the world; for first, for Christs burial and the manner of it, was not by throwing under the earth, for Christs body was wrapt in a linnen cloth by *Joseph*, and laid in a Tomb, or Sepulchre, hewen out of a rock, for that was the custome of the Jews, *è rupe specum excavare condendis corporibus*: Matt 27. 60. *To cut out a place like a cave*, or den, *out of a rock to lay their dead bodies in*, as is observed by a man of great learning, and diligence: thus when we sleep in our houses, we may be said to be buried, having something over our heads.

Secondly, the manner of burying in *Europe* is not by plunging the body into a pit of duſt, but by caſting duſt or dung on the perſon: ſo that their pouring out water on an Infant as a paſſive ſubject, ſeems more to anſwer the ſimilitude of burying, than the caſting into the water, wherein there is ſome motion of the party himſelf contributing to his baptizing.

Thirdly, no man is ſaid to be buried who falls into the water, or under the earth, without he ſtay there ſome conſiderable time.

Fourthly, we are ſaid to be buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, in regard of the ſpiritual union we have with Chriſt in his death, and burial; and this is as much ſignified by pouring water on a perſon (as earth on a dead body) as well, I ſay, as by plunging.

Let us now conſider what remains to be ſaid againſt this abſolute rule, as they would make it; you have ſeen all their main places for plunging, with what demonſtration, at the beſt *ex probabilibus & incertis*, out of probable and uncertain conjectures, which they ſo much tax us withall, and yet the eye ſees not itſelf.

Let us now go on, and conſider what other places of Scripture ſpeak more direct to qualifie this rigid opinion of plunging.

When *John* began firſt to adminiſter his office, it is ſaid *Mat.* 3.5. *That Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan went forth to* John, *and were baptized of him in Jordan:* A man had need have good

good ſtore of confidence to perſwade himſelf & others, that all theſe people were baptized by plunging their whole body into *Jordan*, or that they were dipt in their cloaths, or came with any prepared garments for that purpoſe; all which are neceſſary circumſtances to be conſidered; doubtleſs they were many thouſands that came forth, for the denomination is from the greater number; all *Judea* and *Jeruſalem* &c. that is, a very great many, or the greateſt number of theſe Inhabitants; and how they could be thus baptized, men & women, in their cloaths promiſcuouſly, or how they could get garments ſo ready as to make the act decent, or what places they could have, ſe in: there were ſo many, for the women & the men, to prepare themſelves for the comely adminiſtration of ſuch an Ordinance, I cannot imagine: we hear *John* baptized ſo many, but in what manner is uncertain; & that which is ſo hotly contended for moſt improbable, all things duly conſidered.

The like is of that, *Act.* 2.41. where 3000. were baptized in one day by the Apoſtle, which if it were performed by plunging, could not but be accompanied with the like inconveniences: ſo that it is only ſaid they were baptized, not how; and the word, as you have ſeen, is not ſo ſtrictly to be appropriated to dipping, but admits of a more large ſignification.

Firſt, of the ſame conſideration is that place, *Act.* 8. 12. where it is expreſly ſaid, that men and women were baptized together, & on a ſudden, which can

 hardly

hardly be conceived how it could be done with that gravity the Gospel requires, by plunging in their own proper habits; and such sudden acts could not be done with suitable preparations of garments.

But to come to particular instances, and parallel them together with former places, which are brought to prove this kinde of dipping; and let us judge which hath more demonstration. *Acts* 9. 18. *Paul* was baptized in the house of *Judas*; there is nothing of a *Jordan* or *Ænon*, a river that he was carried unto; neither can they by any thing prove that *Paul* was thus dipt, but only their good will to have it so; neither is it probable that every house had a deep pond belonging to it, or a river running through it, or so vast a receptacle or cistern to hold water as to plunge a mans whole body in it.

Secondly, consider the Jailors case, *Acts* 16. 33. he was baptized in the prison and at midnight, he and his house; he washed their stripes, and they washed him in token of remission of sins.

All that the most rational and profound critick of that judgment can say, is onely this; That it may be supposed he had some great vessel, which some had in these hot countries for washing themselves in, and so made use of it himself to be baptized; but what a poor supposition is this? there is nothing either in the text, or from reason to countenance it; who can imagine that in these hot countryes, where water is so scarce and precious, a poore Jayler should have such a vessel of so large and vast a continent, which must cost

cost much; or that the State would provide such a vessel in the Prison to bathe and refresh Prisoners, who are under suspition, or censures of all sorts of crimes against the State? but no more of that; its too gross to conceive: And why may not we as well argue thus; The Jaylor was baptized late in the night in the Prison: *Ergo*, not by plunging, but washing or pouring out water on him, as they argue from *Joh.* 3. 33. *John* was baptizing in *Ænon* near *Salem*, because there was much water there; *Ergo*, he baptized by plunging; I leave it to any sober judgement to determine; if the one prove that baptizing may be by dipping, the other proves it may be by some other way.

Thus you see the scripture is not so peremptory as these men are, but hath left the method of baptizing in general, and under a latitude: Neither can they bring one expres place which holds it forth either in precept or president (which they call for from us to shew them for our judgement, and will not be satisfied in all other considerations) and have no more but conjectural consequences to prove their absolute determination, but what their confidence supplies: And if there be any absolute need of dipping, it is to cool the heat of these mens spirits, who deny Baptism to be true, because they have not been plunged.

The sum of all is this; They affirm the word, *To baptize*, signifies only immersion, plunging or dipping the whole body under water; we deny it, and shew

 that

that it signifies to wash by pouring on water, and more often in the Old and new Testament; and that when this word is used in the Scripture, its opposed to other words that signifie properly dousing, or casting under water: And I think I may say it, without too much rashness, that they can hardly bring one explicit place in the Old or New Testament, where the word, *To baptize*, is used positively for plunging or dousing under water; and doubtless the most of that judgement know not what the meaning of the words are, else they would not lay the essence of Baptism on a word of such a large use.

The Scriptures being thus cleared, to speak at least, that plunging is not absolutely necessary to constitute the truth of Baptism: Let us now come to consider the morality of this judgement, and the practical conveniencies or inconveniencies of this way of plunging: for if it be the only and pure Gospel-way, it will have no ominous or uncomely aspect or other rules, which are from the same authority, nor any way asperse the Gospel.

1. I know not how to believe that Christ would ordain any Ordinance, and tye souls strictly to it, that cannot be practised universally by all, and but in some places, & at some seasons, without manifold inconveniencies and dangers unto nature: For if only dipping should be baptizing, & every one that believes ought presently to be baptized, how shall they do that live in those hot & dry Countryes where water is so scarce, as it is in many places of the world,

world, who must be forced to go so many miles to come to a River, and yet may only find it a small Brook, with which they can hardly wet their feet in passing over, as it is in many places of the world?

And if there were in every place never so much water, yet how dangerous is it for some bodies who are rheumatick, & subject to Catarrhs & defluxions. in the winter time (for no season should hinder a man from the practise of an Ordinance) in cold & wet to be plunged into the water? it were enough to beget diseases in the most healthy bodies; Christ is more tender of the bodies of his Saints, than to put them into such hazards; and I hope no one will conceive baptism to be a charm to prevent all inconveniences & diseases on the body: yet the zeal of these of that way carries on so furiously, that they think its impossible for them to get any hurt, though they plunge themselves into the water in frost & snow: but its dangerous to tempt God out of his ordinary way of preservation, when there is no absolute necessity for such a practice. Besides, this Ordinance would be a greater yoke and burthen than Circumcision, if this rule of theirs should be so universally followed; for there was no danger to the child by that act, though it seemed bloody and hard: But if all persons (for none are excluded by any weakness or indisposition) should be thus baptized, how eminent a danger would many be in? And if it prove so hazardous to the bodies of many healthy ones, that have in winter-time but accidentally

dentally fallen into the water, though they have not been under water, that it hath coſt them their lives, the violence of cold ſo piercing their bodies and animal ſpirits (of which we have many experiences) how would it be for others who labor under daily weaknesſes? And there is no promiſe that the water ſhall have no power to hurt thoſe which after this manner are baptized, no more than others. Fleſh and blood is the ſame in all, which is the immediate ſubject of ſuch an act; and God doth proportion his Ordinances to keep correſpondency with his other rules of mercy, and preſcriptions for uſe of means. In a word, if this be the onely way of baptizing happy are thoſe that live in hot Countreys, or have bodies of braſſe.

It's ſaid, if 'tis an Ordinance, God will preſerve; but that is the queſtion; and that which demonſtrates it, is not the onely way; if it be a way at all, it is, That it croſſeth Gods rules for preſervation of a mans ſelf; the practice of it at ſome times being a kind of a decree of ſelf-murther, and very unſuitable to the laws of mercy and tenderneſs, that command the very heart of Chriſt; and ſuch an abſolute unqualified command doth not look like an Ordinance of the Goſpel: For if baptizing be immediately to be practiſed after believing (according to their principles) then what ſhould hinder water that they may not be baptized? Suppoſe they be ſick and weak, ſuppoſe the ſeaſon be unſuitable, and yet the ſoul deſires to be baptized? You muſt either go againſt all rules of

of nature to plunge that perſon, or elſe find out ſome other way of baptizing: or elſe a Goſpel command muſt be neglected; for there is nor precept nor preſident of delay of that Ordinance (ſtill to their own poſitions) in all the New Teſtament; and ſo both the baptizer and baptized muſt ſin in performance of a duty, for the one ſins if he by any pretence deſtroys his own health; and the other ſins in being an inſtrument in it. I wiſh men were conſiderate of the nature and effects of theſe things: which if it were more commonly practiſed, we ſhould have heaps of inſtances to make good this conſideration.

2. Its very much to be obſerved, that Chriſt who hath bid us avoid all appearance of evill, ſhould ordain any Ordinance wherein there muſt needs be ſome ſuch appearance fit for fleſh and blood to act on; I have ſo much modeſty as only to preſent this; how women, take it in what habit you will, can be baptized publikely, where all may come with men, and by men, without appearance of evil. And if the Apoſtle would have women to be vailed or covered in the Congregation, becauſe of the Angels, take it either literally or tropically, to ſhew the modeſty of Church-Aſſemblies, and to prevent any ſhadow of temptation; how can we think that its ſutable to Apoſtolical rule, that women ſhould appeare in the open ayre out of their wonted habit, in a garment next to nakedneſſe, and ſo be plunged into water? But I am loth to enter into theſe ſecrets.

I onely propound this, Whether or no that this

baptiſm

baptiſm by plunging, be not rather a baptizing of mens cloaths, and upper garments, than of the body, if the perſon baptized be not naked? and if he or ſhe be, how odious a cuſtome would that be? I cannot but think that that part that is baptized, ought to be naked, that the water may immediatly fall on that place; elſe ſomething elſe muſt be baptized primarily, & the fleſh ſecondarily and by conſequence.

This is the reaſon why we onely poure water on the face. becauſe its the principalleſt part wherein the image of God moſt appears, and the ſoul ſhines forth moſt eminently, on which all the workings of mens humors and affections leave the viſibleſt impreſſion and ſymptomes. And its obſervable, that the ſame word in the Greek (πρόσωπον) ſignifies both the face and the perſon, becauſe the whole perſon is repreſented by the face. And thus we baptize the perſon in baptizing his face, which we can look on, and waſh naked, and not be aſhamed. Let theſe men that are ſo zealous for dipping and plunging the whole body, conſider from all this, what warrant they have from Scripture for their ſo much rigid confidence.

CHAP. XVI.

An explication of that place, Heb. 10. 22. *About waſhing the whole body with pure water; the improper application of it to their manner of baptizing by plunging the whole body.*

AFter all ſtraining and ſhifts of the Antipedobaptiſts, this place in *Heb* 10.22. is forced in to give evidence for that manner of baptizing, formerly ſo much contended for Let *us draw near with a true heart in full aſſurance of faith, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evill conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water*; from hence they infer baptizing muſt be by dipping and plunging, or waſhing the body throughout.

Let us review it with its context, and we ſhall find they chew but upon a dry bone. For,

First the ſcope of the Apoſtle in all this chapter, is not in the leaſt to diſcover the manner of baptizing, but to open two things

1. The fulneſſe of the ſatisfaction and merit of Chriſts offering himſelf, and being a ſacrifice for remiſſion of ſins, in oppoſition to all legal and ſhadowy offerings, as appears from the 1. v. unto the 29. which was begun to be demonſtrated in the former chapters, eſpecially the 9. chap.

2. To encourage ſouls in their approaches to God on ſuch a glorious account now in the New Teſtament,

ment, so in the 19. ver. *Having therefore boldneſſe* (παῤῥησίαν) *or freedom, to enter into the holieſt by the bloud of Jeſus, by a new and living way, &c.* In this 22 v he bids them draw nigh with a true heart, and full affurance of faith, &c.

Secondly, that his ſcope or intent is not to open the manner of baptizing, is evident; for he writes to thoſe that were baptized already, as theſe Hebrews were; for you have no controverſie in this Epiſtle about circumciſion and baptiſm, as in the *Rom. Gal. Phil Coloſ.* but onely concerning Chriſts prieſtly Office, eſpecially compared with the Levitical, Aaronical Prieſthood, and the vertue of Legal-ceremonial ſacrifices, and the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt as High-prieſt, as any one that runs may read; now either they muſt ſay theſe were not baptized before, or elſe muſt conclude that his deſign is not to inform them (and that ſo tranſiently) of the nature or manner of adminiſtring of that Ordinance.

Thirdly, the Apoſtle here doth directly inſtruct the ſoul how to make confident addreſſes to God, *viz.* from the ſenſe of our juſtification and ſanctification together; for ſo by our hearts being ſprinkled from an evil conſcience is meant, & can be meant no other than Chriſts bloud ſprinkled on our ſouls, in the aſſurance of our abſolution from ſin, and the waſhing with pure water no more (but by this outward expreſſion) of the purity of our converſations, as to ſanctification, that we may not come with ſcandal of external unholineſs, when we pretend to be juſtified by Chriſts bloud. Fourthly,

Fourthly, the uſual word is here left out which expreſſeth that Ordinance; and it is your bodies not baptized but waſhed (λελουμένοι) which is a clear alluſion to that of *Lev.* 16. 4. from whence it ſeems to be excerpted: when *Aaron* the high Prieſt was to enter into the holy place, and before he was to be attired for that work, it is ſaid, *He ſhall waſh his fleſh in water, and ſo put them on*; the 70. tranſlate the words thus, λόσεται ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, *He ſhall waſh his whole body with water*, to ingnine the holineſs he ſhould have in his perſon, as from external publick pollutions; the very ſame intent of the Apoſtle is here, that if we would be confident before God, when we approach unto God, we muſt come with Chriſts bloud on our conſciences, and no known pollutions on our converſations; and if we will follow their grounds from comparing the e two places, we may conclude that baptiſm was as much an Ordinance of the Old Teſtament, as the New, for waſhing; the body was uſed in both.

Fifthly, its a uſual phraſe in ſcripture to expreſs the ſanctification of our perſons, from inward and outward defilements, by the waſhing of water and waſhing the body, and yet not in the leaſt to hint out the manner of baptizing by water, as into the ſpecial adminiſtration of that Ordinance; thus in *Eſa.* 1. 16. when God ſaith to his backſliding people, waſh you, make you clean; muſt he needs mean, go and be baptized? but that outward expreſſion is put for the reforming of their waies, and expounded by put-

ting

ting away the evill from their doings or works; thus in *Iob.* 13. Christ expresseth justification and sanctification, by washing in general, and then washing the feet; he that is washed (which is not baptized; for Christ saith he must wash or else *Peter* could have no part in him; and Christ did not baptize) such a one need no more but to wash his feet that is walk holily. So that here is washing, and washing of the feet, and yet neither meant of baptizing with washing: Thus likewise in the *Corinthians* it is said, as to their sanctification, *Now you are washed, now you are cleansed, now you are justified*: he means not Now you are baptized, but of the speciall purification of their hearts, and lives from their former pollutions of flesh and spirit; which though signified by baptism yet so remotely, as no man can gather the constant method of external baptism from it.

Sixthly, he saith your bodies washed (ὑδατι καθαρῳ) with clean or pure water; now I hope as to baptizing none are so foolish as to stand on it, whether they be baptized after a rain when the water is puddle, or whether only in pure & chrystal streams, from an unpuddled spring or ocean; and yet they must be tied to the one as the other, if this Text be their president; and we may as well question from this Text, whether they be rightly baptized, if there be any mud or slime or filth in the water, as whether we be baptized if all our bodies be not washed; but now this expression to set forth holinesse and sanctification, is most apt and full of life: our hearts and

conver-

conversations, in drawing nigh unto God, should be, as if externally they were washed with clean water, transparent and spotless before him, shining with an evangelical brightnesse and spirituall purity; for it will be very hard to draw nigh to God with a good conscience, and a tainted and besmeared body or conversation, with unholy acts, whereby God is so much dishonoured; especially to come, as the Apostle saith in the former part of the verse, *with a true heart and full assurance of faith.*

Seventhly, if he had meant by this washing of the body, baptising, he would not have made such a disproportion (according to their own rule) between the sign and thing signified; for he speaks of the heart being onely sprinkled, and yet the body washed with clean water; now if baptism doth not signifie and seal justification, as well as sanctification, it is not a seal of the Covenant of grace; and if it do signifie, it cannot go beyond the thing signified in expression and outward representation. And if Christs blood in *Heb.* 12.24. be called the blood of sprinkling, and it be one of the main things signified and sealed in baptism; well may we answer it by an outward act, without offence or sin.

Eighthly, grant that by washing the body is meant baptizing here (which you see cannot be extorted by violence, or extracted by any chymical vertue) yet it will not serve their turns: For,

First, the body is said to be washed, when any one or more of the principall parts in sight or use,

are

are washed; and what is done to any eminent or commanding part, it carries the denomination of the whole with it; for *Maries* anointing and washing of Christs head and feet in *Luke* 7.44,45. is interpreted in *John* 11.2. for the anointing of the *Lord*, as much as if she had done it to all his body throughout; though it is onely expresst in the former place of the anointing and washing his head and feet. This is most usuall in Scripture.

Secondly, if they will go to the strictness of the term of washing the body; then,

First, it must be washed naked, or else it is not a washing of the body

Secondly, It must not be a bare dipping or plunging into water, but some other act must be done with the body, *viz.* a rinsing or rubbing, as we do pots or cloaths which we wash, which are not said to be washed, because dipt under water, but so rinsed as the filth and dirt is taken out; I only urge this to shew inevitable inconveniences these men will bring on themselves by such interpretations of Scripture.

Many other considerations might be added, if this Tract would bear the weight of them.

Chap.

CHAP. XVII.

A short summing up of the former principles, and arguing them from the method of the Apostle Peter *about those he baptized,* Acts 10.47.

THat we may bring up all to a full conclusion, let that place be considered, *Acts* 10. 47. and the manner of the Apostles arguing in it, which is most special to what we would prove; his argument lies in this, *They have received the holy Ghost as well as we: Ergo,* what should hinder water? where there is a qualification, there may be an administration of that Ordinance; this is grounded on a common principle; now if we observe,

First, the Apostle changes the usual expression, and saith not, *Seeing they have believed as well as we,* but *seeing they have received the holy Ghost as well as we, what should hinder?* The argument is from the equivalency of the qualification; for whereas he saith all along formerly, *they believed & were baptized*; and to the Eunuch, *Act.* 8.37. *If thou believest thou maist*; but here, *seeing they have received the holy Ghost as well as we*; This change of phrase shews the qualification not to lie in one term or expression, but in the universal equality of Gospel-manifestation, to some one way, to some another; that if any tittle in the Gospel can be found properly, either by Gods

promiſe or our judgement, applicable to any perſon, we may ſay, What ſhould hinder water? now to receive the holy Ghoſt, is the largeſt and moſt vaſt expreſſion, as to a qualification, that ever could be mentioned, taking in both real graces and all external gifts and priviledges, which are all conveyed by that holy Spirit, whether common or ſpecial, as is before expreſt in another Chapter.

We ſhall deſire on the Apoſtles account to argue from all theſe pregnant Texts of Scripture concerning Infants; and having the ſame premiſes we ſhall not certainly draw a wrong concluſion, when we find the Scriptures giving ſuch titles to Infants, and ſo many ſpecial carriages of Chriſt to them, which amounts to as much as is ſpoken of any that were baptized, why may not we ſay with *Peter*, *What ſhould hinder water?* as for inſtance,

If Infants be in the Covenant, that *Abrahams* promiſe belongs to them, as we have proved, *What ſhould hinder water?*

If Infants be holy, *What ſhould hinder water?* Theſe which are viſible Saints may be baptized; but ſo are the Infants of believers; for they are called (ἅγια) 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. The ſame name given to denominate all Saints; now to be holy is as much as to be a believer, as to receive the holy Ghoſt is made all one with being a believer; and what then ſhould hinder water?

So again, when the Gentiles and their poſterity are ingraffed into the ſame root, *Rom.* 11. which is

Abraham

Abraham and the Covenant, and the branches holy is the root, what ſhould hinder water?

If Chriſt was angry when Infants were forbidden to come to him, and charged his diſciples to ſuffer them to be brought, who can forbid water? eſpecially when Chriſt took them up in his arms, laid his hands on, & bleſſed them, which is as much & more than is done in baptiſm, what ſhould hinder water to be caſt on them? and ſo we may argue from every place in the former diſcourſe, upon this very principle; for the Apoſtle argues neither from precept nor example, but from a parallel qualification, becauſe they had received the holy Ghoſt; & ſurely all theſe places of ſcripture concerning infants, will fully amount to make up an equivalent qualification in them to a viſible profeſſion of grown perſons, & ſo we may argue on the ſame ground with *Peter*; beſides Infants are capable of receiving the holy Ghoſt as well as grown perſons, and why not capable of water? if they ſay it is only a viſible believer, a viſible profeſſor that is the ſubject; We anſwer,

You ſee the Apoſtle uſeth ſeveral expreſſions about it, ſometimes actively, ſometimes paſſively, ſometimes if thou believeſt, here ſeeing they have received the holy Ghoſt, but never ſaith a viſible Saint, or a viſible believer, or one that actually profeſſeth; and ſo may we ſay, ſeeing the promiſe is to them, ſeeing they are holy, ſeeing they are called Diſciples, ſeeing they had Chriſts hands laid on them, and were bleſſed, ſeeing they are capable of receiving

the holy Ghoſt, what ſhould hinder water?

Queſt. If they ſay ſtill there is no command; I anſwer,

Firſt, there is as much as is ſaid of others that were baptized.

Secondly, there is no command in terms from Chriſt or his Apoſtles to baptize profeſſing believers, or thoſe that ſhould receive the holy Ghoſt; yet they were baptized.

Thirdly where there is parallel characters to ſhew qualification, there may be the ſame outward ſign applied; on this principle the Apoſtle reaſons in this Scripture: it is only to be wondered how ſo many direct places of Scripture, which cannot but ſparkle in the conſciences of thoſe which are diligent and diving into truth, can be ſo lightly evaded and made nothing of, while men pretend to ſearch truth impartially without deceit or guile.

CHAP. XVIII.

Wherein is ſhewed who is to adminiſter this Ordinance of baptiſm, according to the rule of the Goſpel.

AS theſe that are contrary to Infant-Baptiſm are ſtrict & moſt ſevere in other circumſtances which they think muſt be in that Ordinance, ſo they are moſt ſlight and rude in their conſiderations and practiſe, as to the adminiſtrator of that Ordinance, making every male diſciple, or any one that can give an

an occaſional word of exhortation, the miniſter of this Ordinance, which they do otherwiſe ſhut up, as in the moſt holy place, and put the very ſubſtance of the Goſpel in it; this is unſutable to the Goſpel, and makes baptiſm one of the pooreſt and loweſt Ordinances, and of no ſuch ſolemnity, ſeeing every Diſciple may baptize another, and he that can ſpeak any thing of the Goſpel may do ſuch an act.

But if we trace the rule, we ſhall ſee, that as it is an Ordinance of publick cognizance, ſo it muſt be adminiſtred by a publick Officer, who hath received commiſſion authoritatively from Chriſt and his Church, and that it was never adminiſtred by any one but he that was either ordinarily, or extraordinarily called thereunto; begin with *John* the Baptiſt, ſo called from his work and deſignment to the adminiſtration of that Ordinance; he was extraordinarily called, as the propheſies of him witneſs, with the circumſtances of his birth and behaviour, *Luke* 1.7. &c. *Matth.* 3.1,2,3.

All the time of Chriſts miniſtry, his Diſciples by immediate commiſſion from himſelf baptized, and none elſe: and we all know how they were called, and who gave them power.

When Chriſt gave up all his power and authority to be continued to the end of the world, or his ſecond coming, *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations baptizing them*, and gave them their general & publick commiſſion, he gave it to theſe that were to be Apoſtles, and to theſe that ſhould ſucceed them in ordinary,

and as by ſetled commiſſion, not to every one that ſhould be made a Diſciple; this was a commiſſion to them at large, and yet appropriated to ſuch an order, without we will ſay all are commiſſioned to teach and baptize.

Afterwards, when the Goſpel-order of Churches came to be ſetled, & particular inſtructions given, as to the foundation and method of adminiſtration in Churches, it was never adminiſtred by any but thoſe that were for the time extraordinary, or ordinary ſetled Officers of the Church, whoſe names are ſummed up in 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29. and *Eph.* 4. 11. Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers; beſides theſe, none have office or power to ſuch adminiſtration but onely theſe.

Thoſe that are the more ſober and intelligent ſort of our oppoſites, grant us this, that the adminiſtration of baptiſm is of publick cognizance; and that ordinarily it muſt be adminiſtred by thoſe which are in publick and ſet office; but generally every brother among them of any ſuppoſed gift may be a baptizer.

As for *Philip* and *Ananias*, who baptized, the firſt was an Evangeliſt, an extroordinary officer, as the Apoſtles, raiſed & inſpirited, & impowered much after the ſame manner; and if we conſult with *Acts* 8. he had ſpecial commiſſion and authority from heaven, by a Divine call, to perform that act on the Eunuch; and to ſay *Ananias* who baptized *Paul*, as one of their own judgment ſaith well, he was deputed in

in an extraordinary manner to that miniſtery, *Act.* 9. the Lord appearing to him in a viſion; and theſe examples cannot be drawn into an ordinary rule, without the ſame circumſtances be found uſual.

And it muſt needs be ſo that none but one of the ſetled officers of the Church, who is to preach the Goſpel, may be a baptizer.

Firſt, becauſe it is a Church-Ordinance; Chriſt hath now left the keyes to the Church, ſet in the Church ſucceſſively ſuch perſons, who are actually to adminiſter all Ordinances in it; and if it be a Church-Ordinance, only theſe may adminiſter it who are called to one of theſe offices in the Church; all grant this that it is a Church-Ordinance, though ſome take the Church more largely, others more ſtrictly.

Secondly, it is an act of power to baptize, *Mat.* 28. *All power is given to me in heaven and earth, Go teach & baptize*; now power is conveyed by a ſpecial commiſſion and call. For a man to exerciſe a gift of knowledge by utterance, needs no ſuch ſolemnity; but to baptize, it being a ſealing of a ſpecial priviledge to others, muſt come from an office-power, and ſo cannot ordinarily be adminiſtred by a gifted Diſciple.

Thirdly, there would be no diſtinction as to power, between Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers in adminiſtration of any Ordinance, and every brother of the Church, if their rule ſtand; this is the common confuſion of the moſt of the contrary judgment, which utterly overthrows the other of Goſpel-Churches.

CHAP. XIX.

On Christs being baptized by John, *when he was about the thirtieth year of his age; whether any thing can be gathered from it against baptizing of Infants.*

THis is the last plea urged from Christs example, that he was not baptized untill about the thirtieth year, therefore none but grown persons ought to be baptized, if there be any force in Christs example.

To which is answered, 1. In general, actings are not always to be our examples; for some act he did meerly as Mediator, God-man, unimitable by us, as to be crucified for our sins; some he did out of special reason, and eminent emergency, as to fast forty dayes and nights in the wilderness, with many such like up and down the Scripture, that are no rules to us: his personal and representative acts, and these which have been acted upon extraordinary occasion and reasons, cannot be drawn into practical rule of example to us.

2. If we will take Christs example for a rule in this, that he was baptized when so grown up, why then we may as well take Christs practice, as our example in the active sense, *be baptized none*, therefore none are to baptize; the same holds as strong as the other; if any say the rule afterward warrants that,

so it doth the baptizing of Infants, as hath been formerly proved.

3. And more home, Christ was a Saint in the womb, he professed his faith from a childe, disputed with the Doctors about Divine things when he was but 12. years old, so that he could be baptized with an infallible evidence at first, and yet was not baptized untill such an age; hence if we will follow Christs example, though men be known to be professors, and never so godly, yet they must not be baptized untill just they come to the same stature, and term of years that Christ was baptized in; the reason is stronger for the one than the other, because Christ, though he had such a visible, such an infallible right to it, yet did abstain from the practice of it, untill just such a time, which he chose out as fittest; so that the time hath as much force to make an example, and bindes as strictly to the observance of it, as the general consideration of him as a grown person: upon this account no man must be baptized untill he be 29. or full 30 years of age.

4. There may be many considerations why Christ was baptized at years

1. That he might enter on his publick ministry with the more greater solemnity of such an Ordinance, and have a testimony from heaven to him in that Ordinance, which was given, *The Holy Ghost descending on him in the form of a Dove*, *Mat* 3. two last *v.* Now Christs entrance into his publick ministry, began immediately after his baptism, how he con-

verst

verſt for the moſt part of the former years, is very dark in Scripture.

2. It might be alſo, becauſe he would give a teſtimony to *John Baptiſt*, who, though he was deſigned from the womb to that work, yet began to act his office but a little while before, and had ſoon done. It's a queſtion whether he baptized any conſiderable time after he baptized Chriſt; but juſt as Chriſt did ariſe in his miniſtry, *John* fell in his.

3. As there is no reaſon to be given why Chriſt ſhould live ſo long, and not take on him his publick miniſtry, untill ſuch an age, nor may it be urged as ſuch an example to us; ſo there is no reaſon peremtorily to be given why he was not baptized untill then, and ſo the rule is uncertain, and of no value. But this example is contrary to the following rule left for baptizing, according to their own principles; For,

1. That Ordinance was immediately adminiſtred (as they) after believing, and profeſſion; Chriſt was a known Believer, and Profeſſor before; neither did he make a new profeſſion to *John* when he came to be baptized; but *John* rather ſcrupled it as an act too high for him to perform, as to ſuch a glorious perſon, *Mat.* 3. *ſuffer it to be done* (ſaith Chriſt) &c. It would be a ſin for us to delay ſo long

2. Chriſts baptiſm was upon no other grounds than ours, his to fulfill all righteouſneſs in our ſtead, o. to waſh away unrighteouſneſs, the filth of the fleſh, and ſpirit, as an outward ſign of it, and ſo can-

cannot come under the common rule; this I conceive ſufficient to be ſpoken as to that conſideration; *there onely remains*, that queſtion which will eaſily be anſwered on the former grounds, if they prove true, as they are demonſtrated, *The Lord give a bleſſing to theſe conſiderations on your heart.*

CHAP. XX.

That Baptiſm doth not form a Church.

SO much do our oppoſites advance Baptiſm, that they make it the onely conſtitutive principle of a GoſpelChurch, by which men enter into the Church, and are made viſible Members onely by its adminiſtration, and in their own method. But we ſhall ſoon dethrone that poſition by the authority and force of Scripture and rational argumentation.

Onely in general, I doubt our Divines have unwittingly given them too much ground to affirm as they do, calling it an entrance into the Church, an initiating Ordinance, ſeal, and by their practice of late to ſet the Font nigh the Church-porch; though I would not much ſtand upon it how proper it is to call it an initiating Ordinance: (a phraſe I have uſed in this diſcourſe *Pro forma*) without it be becauſe it is the firſt ſeal to be adminiſtred in the Order of Sacraments; but it will be eaſily proved that Baptiſm gives no eſſence or being either to a Church, or membership.

1. Be-

1. Becauſe a man muſt be a member, and of a Church, ere he can be Baptized according to the Goſpel rule.

2. Sacraments are Ordinances to be adminiſtred in the Church, and to the Church, which ſuppoſeth the exiſtence of the Church before; thus 1*Cor.* 12.28. *Epheſ.* 4. 11.12,13. the Lord hath ſet in, and given all officers to the Church, if ſo, Sacraments, which muſt be adminiſtred by officers, if rightly.

3. A Church may be without Baptiſm, and yet be as true and as real a Church; as the *Iſraelites* were ſo long in the wilderneſſe without Circumciſion, which was as much an initiating Ordinance, as ever Baptiſm was; now nothing can be without its form, and exiſt.

4. That cannot be the form of a Church or make a man a Member, which remains the ſame, and untouched after excomunication, whereby a man is cut off from memberſhip at preſent, but now though the Church may take away his memberſhip, they cannot his Baptiſm, which is the ſame ſtill, and is not loſt.

5. For this is an abſolute rule, that that which gives the form, or being to a Church, it muſt ceaſe when the Church ceaſeth or when a Member ceaſeth to be a Member it muſt ceaſe with it; and that muſt be renewed, as often as memberſhip is renewed, and ſo one muſt be Baptized again, as often as he renews Memberſhip; this is moſt abſurd, yet muſt follow from ſuch a principle.

6. Ba-

6. Baptiſm is a ſign, and ſeal, therefore gives no being to any thing, but confirms it; It is a conſequent act, and ſuppoſeth ſomething preexiſtent.

Obj. As for that place they ſo much ſtand on, *Act.* 2.41. *As many as received the word gladly, were Baptized, and there was added that day about three thouſand ſouls*; hence they ſay they were added by Baptiſm.

Sol. The words ſay not, they were added by Baptiſm, but puts a full point, or ſtop after that ſentence, *as many as gladly received the word, were Baptized.* There that ſentence ends. And the apoſtle goes on a new account; and ſaith, *there were added that day* 3000. *ſouls*, but doth not at al ſhew the manner of their adding; ſo that theſe words are rather a recapitulation, and ſumming up the number of Church Members added that day, than any deſcription of the way of their taking into the Church: as if one ſhould ſay, he had 3000l. in gold added to his eſtate, he only ſhews it is ſo, but not how he came to have that added, ſo it muſt be here; and the former reaſons prove the impoſſibility of ſuch an interpretation.

2. *Obj.* There is one place more urged to prove Baptiſm to be the form of a Church, and that which makes a Member, which is, 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *We are all Baptized into one body*, there Baptiſm onely embodies members.

Sol. To which I anſwer firſt, The Apoſtle ſpeaks there primarly of this baptiſm of the Spirit, not

of

of water; So by one Spirit, we are Baptized into one Body, not ſo much of Baptiſm by water.

But ſecondly, grant it to be meant of Baptiſm by water, yet it proves nothing that Baptiſm is the form of that body, which hath its matter and form, holineſs, and union before baptiſm; baptized into one body, doth not here ſhew the eſſential conſtitution of a Church, but the confirmed union.

For firſt, we are ſaid in *Gal* 3 27. *to be baptized into Chriſt*; now none will conjecture, that baptiſm gives the form of union with Chriſt, but onely ſeals it; ſo into one body, may be as to the unity of communion in the ſame body.

2. The phraſe of baptizing into, or in one body, ſhews the body exiſtent, and in perfect being before, elſe we could not be baptized in a body, or into a body; for when one is baptized firſt, into what body is he, and the ſecond, and third incorporated? untill a body be compleat, they cannot be ſaid to be baptized into it, or in it; therefore baptiſm cannot conſtitute the form of a Church, which is this body, ſaying, we are baptized into it, that is, to hold union and communion with ſuch a body.

3. This argument is inſerted more to prevent Schiſm, than to expreſs the way of firſt embodying or conſtitution of Churches, as the whole context demonſtrates.

4. It is the ſame reaſon with the *Lords Supper*, and we may as well be ſaid as to the firſt conſtitution, to conſtitute Churches by that Sacrament, as by baptiſm,

baptiſm, 1 *Cor.* 10.16,17. *The cup of bleſſing we bleſſe, is it not the communion of the bloud of Chriſt? the bread that we break, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt? for we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.* So that we may as well be ſaid to be gathered into a Church by the Lords Supper, as by Baptiſm, for by it we are made one body, and one ſpirit.

But laſtly, if Baptiſm doth eſſentially conſtitute a Church, and is its form, then all who are Baptized are real Members of the Church, and muſt have all priviledges, be they never ſo looſe and vain; for they have the eſſential qualification, and the perfect form, and what will any deſire more? and ſtrange conſequences muſt needs follow: you may make whom you will Members, and make them Members before they are Members, and Baptize into a body before there is a body, or any knowledge of what frame the body is; you may Baptize and have no Church, for they may never come into Union, and Communion, who are baptized upon theſe terms, and then no Church can be conſtituted; for who ſhall baptize firſt? for he muſt have an extraordinary Commiſſion, for he can have no ordinary delegation, untill the form be introduced which makes the Church, and that form is not, untill a competent number be baptized, and ſo Church-power muſt be exerciſed firſt without a Church, and political power without a body

It is wonderful to imagine how theſe that differ, ſlight

flight and unchurch all the Congregations, though made up of the pureſt, and ſpecialleſt Saints without mixture of humane allay, and meerly in this principle they are not baptized in their form, nor plunged under water, which with them is onely baptizing; and under this principle, Faith and repentance, and the moſt reſplendent graces of the beſt Saints muſt lye buried, and no Church, if not thus dipt: I hope you ſee the fallacy, if not the perfect folly of this poſition, and how Churches ſtand upon other principles more firm, and ſure, though we would not loſe any ornament of the Goſpel to adorn this body, yet we dare not conſtitute it of ſuch ingredients.

A GOSPEL-

A
GOSPEL-ORDINANCE
CONCERNING
The ſinging of Scripture-Pſalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs; the lawfulneſs of that Ordinance.

LONDON,
Printed for *R.W.* and are to be ſold at the *three Daggers* in *Fleetſtreet*. 1657.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the ſinging of Scripture-Pſalms, Hymns and ſpiritual Songs; the lawfulneſs of that Ordinance.

THE next publick controverſie which Satan hath raiſed to diſturb the Churches, is about the practiſe of ſinging Scripture-Pſalms, on purpoſe to deprive the Saints of the benefit of that ſoul-raiſing, & heart-raviſhing Ordinance, by which God is publickly and ſolemnly praiſed, & the ſpirit filled with the glory of God; & becauſe your hearts may be ſtabliſhed in every truth, & not ſo eaſily perſwaded to part with ſuch a holy Ordinance, I could not but endeavor to clear up this alſo, which you have in this method.

First that ſinging of Pſalms, Hymns, and ſpiritual, Songs, vocally with the voice, and muſically, is an Ordinance of the New Teſtament, conſtantly to be practiſed in the Churches of Chriſt.

Secondly, Open unto you the three expreſſions, Pſalms, Hymns, and Songs, wherein they agree, and whether there be any difference between them.

Thirdly ſhew you that it is the Pſalms of *David*, *Aſaph*, *Heman*, and the Hymns and ſpiritual Songs of theſe holy men, which are recorded in Scripture, that it is the matter ordinarily to be ſung.

Fourthly, anſwer the main objections of the diſſenters; theſe are ſcattered up and down this ſmall Treatiſe.

For the firſt, it is clear from *Eph.* 5.19. he bids them be filled with the Spirit, λαλοῦντες, ſpeaking to one another, and in *Col* 3 16 *Teaching and admoniſhing one another* διδάσκοντες. καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς. What ever there be as to the matter of them, yet the ſinging of them is commanded as an Ordinance, and a ſpecial Ordinance for edification; That the Apoſtle exhorts here to this as an Ordinance, is clear;

Firſt, becauſe he ſpeaks to the whole Church, and as a publick duty, not appropriated to any Office, but as a commandment univerſally on all.

Secondly, he doth diſtinguiſh this Ordinance from that of preaching or teaching doctrinally, which belongs to the Officer, or occaſionally to a gifted brother; for he doth not only ſay, as in other places, teach and admoniſh; but in Pſalms and Hymns, and Songs, which ſhews the manner of the teaching and admoniſhing, not in the general, but in ſuch a way as by ſinging with Pſalms, &c. and as Mr. *Cotton* well obſerves,

obſerves, if the Apoſtle had meant the ordinary and common way of teaching, he would have ſaid, teach one another out of the Pſalms, or from them, rather than in, or with them, which is the uſual language of the holy Ghoſt in expreſſing ſuch a duty; ſo in Peul's example, *Acts* 28 23 & ſo *Philip* is ſaid to preach Jeſus to the Eunuch (ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης) from that Scripture in Iſaiah: and ſurely he would never have added the word (ᾄδοντες) in the following part, ſinging with melody in your hearts, if this teaching & admoniſhing were not to be diſcovered in ſuch a peculiar Ordinance. To which places we muſt add that of the 1 *Cor* 14, 15, 16. where the Apoſtle ſpeaks to the Church, as to the orderly adminiſtration of that Ordinance, 16, 17, v. where he ſpeaks of ſinging as a diſtinct duty, and to be done in publick before the Church; and that phraſe of ſinging with the ſpirit, and with underſtanding, is very emphatical, as Divines obſerve; for I cannot ſing with the ſpirit, but I muſt alſo with underſtanding; but the underſtanding here, muſt be meant of others who hear me, and joyn with me in that act; however, publick ſinging was then an Ordinance ſolemnized in the Church; and we ſhall hereafter ſee what kind theſe Pſalms were they ſung; Thus *James* 5. 13. *If any be merry, let him ſing Pſalms*; though this be particular in the Text, yet it is of the ſame conſideration with the former; and theſe places hold forth the inſtitution; ſinging is an Ordinance, and a ſpecial one in the Goſpel.

Secondly, that it is not only meant of an inward frame of rejoycing; but that it is of the voice; is most apparent.

1. From the very words of these Texts; *Speaking to one another, teaching one another, in Psalms, and Hymns*, &c. Now no man can speak to edifie others by inward workings, or silent rejoycings.

2. Besides the melody, to be made in our hearts, we must sing with melody which shews not only the inward frame, but the outward act, & order; for melody in the heart were enough to express the inward grace; but he adds an outward expression, *Singing with melody in your hearts*; so that it is with the voice as with the heart.

3. Singing in Scripture is ever put in distinction from bare reading or speaking; and commonly signifies a modulation of the tongue, or expressing anything musically and in tune, and so it is a musical speaking.

4. There would be the greatest confusion of Ordinances; for preaching & prayer would be made all one with singing; nay, internal works would be found contrary to outward expressions; & if there be any such things as preaching; & prayer & exhortation, it must be different from singing, even to the most ignorant; for no man will say, when a man meerly speaks or preaches, he sings, without his tone do make them call him a singing preacher or talker, as too many either out of affectation or custome have given just cause to suspect.

5. This

5. This is undeniable, if there be any such command as to sing, it is visible; for else no man could at any time be said to sing or not sing; it must be an outward act; for else we must say we have only souls for that Ordinance, and bodies for all the rest.

6. All that ever sung in the Gospel, as to practice, sung vocally, *Mat.*26.30. *They went out and sung an Hymn*; that must be with an audible voice, *Act.*16.25. *Paul* and *Silas* sung, and all heard them; and if it be an inward act only, who shall know when men sing or think; or would they have men to be gods, to judge when men sing Psalmes, and Hymns, and spiritual songs inwardly? what need these names outwardly? A more ungrounded opinion was never invented by the devil, and surely he hath fitted it for the weaker and most perfectly captivated sorts of proselytes, who have first lost their reasons, and then their consciences.

Can my inward joy teach another? or my private ejaculations admonish another? I wish Satan have not these men at his will: they would have singing to be an Ordinance, but no man to hear them; So that if singing be not a distinct visible Ordinance, then no man can tell what it is to sing at all, but the same with preaching, praying, talking, or only an invisible motion of the soul, known to God only; which is most absurd, when we look on the weight of these places of Scripture mentioned formerly.

Ob. If any object, If singing be with the voice, why not with other instruments, as Lute, and Harp, and Organs, &c. as in the Old Testament. *Sol.*

Sol. First, in the New Testament the voice and heart are onely Gods instruments; this holds forth the special way of worship from soul and body, as from one person; artificial instruments are laid aside not natural ones.

Secondly, the voice is still required, because it is the most immediate Interpreter of the heart, and no outward instrument besides is so.

Thirdly, nothing can be expresst so significantly in outward characters, as by the voice; and the best expressions of God we have in words, and the tongue can best make out them.

Fourthly, the union of heart, and tongue, or voice, makes up the compleat expression of Gods praises, without any other consideration; for we have not now any thing as typical to look at; as Lute, and Harpe, &c. were in the Old Testament to praises, so ceremonies were to Christs sacrifice; when the substance came, they ceased; there is no need of them now, the spirit being more abundantly poured forth; and they have no significancy; but there needs soul and body alwayes to sing out Divine stories, while in this world.

Fifthly, this hath been prophesied of, and long before the New Testament dayes, by the Prophets, of singing to God with a lively voice, when the voice shall be as Lute & Harpe, and all instruments to God, as in *Esa.* 52. 8. (as Mr. *Cotton* in that precious Treatise of his, worthy all mens consideration) compared with *Rom.* 10 14. *Psal.* 100. 1. *Psal* 95. 1, 2. all places referring prophetically to the gospel. Sixthly

Sixthly, if they dare grant this, that there must be no singing by voice, then they cut off themselves from any sort of singing by gift, in Psalms, or Hymns, & Spiritual Songs, & any outward way of expressing Gods praises; and must blot out singing in any way publickly as to be looked after, though a person never so much inspired by the holy Ghost (after their own sense) should extemporarily compose, & breath forth the most glorious Sonnets, or heavenly *Anthems*; for what is not a duty in it self, and general in the nature of it, is not a duty to the most raised spirit, if never so well gifted in such a mysterie.

But the wiser sort of the contrary judgement, who consult with Scriptures & the nature of things, will not own the dissent of others as to this, but confess singing of Psalmes must be by voice, & lay it on another foundation; that it is Psalms, &c. but not these we sing, that the command speaks of, but psalms of another constitution, from a peculiar gift, and so to be looked on by the Church, *viz.* not to sing *Davids* Psalms, or *Asaphs*, or the like; but from the fillings of the Spirit in such a person, & on a sudden breaking forth for the edification of the Church

I end this with what *Zanchy* saith of these places; These words ἐν χάριτι, and ἐν τῇ καρδία ὑμῶν singing with grace in your hearts, *non excludunt vocem oris, verum excludunt hypocrisin & vanitatem; ex qua ferè loquuntur ebrii vino* (& ἐν καρδία *valet atque ex* τῆς καρδίας) they do not exclude the voice, but hypocrisie, & vanity, from which men drunk with wine do sing;

ſing; and in your hearts, is as much as from your hearts, that is, not vainly, or as hypocritically, but as from inward ſenſe: So the Greek Scholiaſts, Μὴ τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ.

CHAP. II.

What's meant by theſe three expreſſions, Pſalms, Hymns, Spiritual-Songs; *how they are uſed in the Old Teſtament and the New Teſtament; from which the matter of* ſinging *is cleared.*

THE next difference is about the matter of ſinging, which all muſt grant to be Pſalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual-Songs: but what theſe Pſalms were, &c. and how to diſtinguiſh them one from another, muſt be debated ere we can clear the point between theſe three expreſſions; ſome conſtitute one difference, ſome another.

Ψάλμοι *Pſalms*, ſay ſome, are ſuch ſongs which were ſung with other Inſtruments beſides the tongue.

Zanchius.

Ὕμνοι, *Hymns*, ſuch as are made only to expreſs the praiſes, and ſet out the excellencies of God. Ὠδαὶ, *Songs*, ſuch as contain not only praiſes, but exhortations, propheſies, thankſgiving; and theſe only ſung with the voice and tongue

Others

Others difference them thus: *Pſalmes* are thoſe which were penn'd by *David* and others, drawn up into meet rules to be ſung in the Temple in a muſical ſtrain. *Hymns* are thoſe extemporal praiſes which break forth upon occaſion from a heart filled with the Spirit, and obſervant of Gods goodneſs. *Songs* or *Odes* they call ſuch that were premeditated not without ſome art: Theſe they call the Songs of *Moſes*, *Deborah*, *Hannah*, *Simeon*, *Mary*, &c.

Grotius.

But we ſhall find, if we conſult the uſe of the words, the difference will not be conſiderable between them, and that they are uſed promiſcuouſly in the Old Teſtament, from whence we muſt learn how they are to be taken in the New: Now,

1. I finde they are uſed in general as the title of *Davids* Pſalms, which are named promiſcuouſly by theſe three words.

2. That the three Hebrew words, *viz.* מזמור *Mizmor*, שיר *Schir*, תהלים *Tehillim*, to which theſe three, Ψάλμος, Ὕμνος Ὠδὴ do fully anſwer, are uſed in the pſalms one for another, without diſtinction; and ſometimes two of them joyned together as the title of one pſalm; ſometimes all three joyned together in one title; we could heap up examples in this kind. *Judges* 5 3. ſaith *Debroah*, אשירה אומר, *I will ſing, I will ſing unto the Lord* it's tranſlated by the 70; ᾄσωμαι καὶ ψαλῶ here is two words; the one uſed for a Pſalm, the other for an

an Ode or Song put to expreſs one a- 1 *Chron* 16. 9. the two ſame words are tranſlated thus in the 70. ᾄσατε αὐτῷ ὑμνήσατε, *Sing unto the Lord, ſing an Hymn unto the Lord.* In *Pſal.* 105. 3. which is the ſame Pſalm one y inſerted into the body of the Book of the Pſalms; the former word זמרו, is rendred by ψάλλετε, *ſing Pſalms*: and thus the ſame words in the ſame verſe is expreſt by theſe two words, yet hold forth one thing. In *Eſay* 12. 5. זמרו is rendred ὑμνήσατε. In the title of *Pſal.* 38. 1. *Mizmor* is rendred by ᾠδὴν which is here tranſlated *a Song:* and in moſt of the titles one is uſed for another without diſtinction: and שיר *Schir*, which is moſt uſually rendred by ᾠδὴν *a Song*, yet is alſo rendred by ψάλμος *a Pſalm*. *Pſal.* 45. 1. and 47. 1. And by ὕμνος, *a Hymn*, *Eſay* 42. 10. As for the other word תהלים *Tehillim*, that comprehends fully both Hymns and Songs; it is the general title of the Book of Pſalms, where the variety of them are contained. And as ſome particular Pſalms are called in the Greek Hymns or Odes according to the two former words: ſo this word is put at top, holding forth the ſignificancy of all the reſt, and diſtinguiſhing the Pſalms from all other Books of Scripture, as the e that know the ſuperſcription of that Book underſtand: and it ſignifies the moſt univerſal and full way of praiſing God, eſpecially by ſinging; and it's expreſt by various words, as (ἀινεῖν. ἐπαινεῖν) *to praiſe*; (ἐξομολόγειν) *to commend or ſet forth the reputation of another*; (δοξάζειν) *to glorifie or diſcover the glory of another*: (εὐλογεῖν)

(εὐλογεῖν) *to bleſſe*, with many other expreſſions; So in particular (ψάλλειν) *Pſal.* 145. 1. but moſt eſpecially in this laſt word (תהלה) which is a word for all pſalms expreſt by (ὕμνος) *a Hymn*; as 2 *Chron.* 7. 6. and 23. 13. *Pſalm* 39. 4. 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. *Pſal* 21. 13. *Pſal* 64. 1. and 99. 3. where the one word is tranſlated by the other.

For their conjunction of each of them together in one a title of a pſalm, is very uſual & often inverted: The title of *Pſal.* 29. 1. is in the Hebrew, מזמר שיר *Mizmor Schir*; in the Greek tranſlation its ψάλμος ᾠδῆς, *a Pſalm of a Song, or a Song and a Pſalm.* So 64. 1. and 47. 1. and 86. 1. but in 65. 1. there the title is שיר מזמר and tranſlated ᾠδὴ ψάλμου *A Song of a Pſalm, or a Song and Pſalm.* So *Pſal.* 82. 1. But unto the title of *Pſal* 75. the 70 Greek Interpreters (from whom theſe words are borrowed in the New Teſtament) do adde all the three together; Εἰς τὸ τέλος. ἐν ὕμνοις. ψάλμος τῷ Ἀσάφ, ᾠδὴ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους; *A Pſalm to Aſaph in or with Hymns; a Song to the Aſſyrians.* By all which we ſee, and might by many more,

1. That there is not ſuch a criticall diſtinction to be made between a ſpiritual Pſalm, and a Hymn, and Song, but that they are put in differently one for another.

2. Having opened the words with their uſe (I hope with advantage to thoſe that know the language of the Hebrew with the Septuagint) let us now conſider them as the matter to be ſung, and what theſe

Pſalms,

Pſalms, Hymns and Spiritual *Songs* are; whether *Davids*, *Aſaphs*, *Hemans*, and ſuch other which are found in Scripture pen'd by holy men upon ſpecial occaſions, or another of a new compoſure; the former of which I affirm to be an Ordinance of the New Teſtament.

1. Theſe are the titles given ſolely to *Davids* P*ſalm*., and the other Scripture-*Songs*, which theſe holy men, Divinely inſpired, breathed forth, & left on record: And as Mr. *Cotton* excellently argues, What reaſon can there be why the Apoſtle ſhould direct us in our ſinging to the very title of *Davids* P*ſalms*, and other Scripture Songs, if he meant we ſhould not ſing theſe Pſalms and Songs? Either we muſt exclude *Davids Pſalms* and the reſt from being called Pſalms, or Hymns, or Spiritual-Songs, or elſe they muſt be ſung as well as others.

2. The names are borrowed from the Greek Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, and there is no diſtinction of them in the New: neither can any one tell what they mean, but as by their uſe in the Old Teſtament: Now theſe names were uſed there as peculiar characters to expreſs and diſtinguiſh the works of *David*, & the reſt which were penned to be ſung in the Church: Let theſe which are againſt ſinging *Davids* P*ſalms*, & of other holy men, ſhew us any one word or ſylable in the New Teſtament, where any of theſe words are taken in any other ſenſe than as they were in the Old, & yet we are commanded to ſing them in the New; on this ground the caſe would be

be ſoon concluded; when the queſtion is propounded, (granting this is a command for ſinging) what ſhall we ſing? why, Pſalms, Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs; how ſhall we know what theſe are? we muſt look in Scripture, where theſe words are uſed; now we find them here explained ſo properly as in the Old Teſtament; where they are the uſual titles of *Davids* Pſalms, and the ſongs of other Holy men, and no other uſe of them expreſt in the New; why may not we judge then, theſe are the Pſalms, and Hymns, & ſpiritual Songs we are there commanded for to ſing? But,

3. Come to the New Teſtament, and there when ever Chriſt or his Apoſtles ſpeak of Pſalms, they refer us to Scripture-Pſalms, *Luke* 20. 42. (Chriſt ſaith) As it is written in the Book of the Pſalms, that is the 110. P*ſal. The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, ſit thou at my right hand:* in *Luke* 24. 44. when Chriſt would make an exact diviſion of the Old Teſtament, he divides them into the *Law* of *Moſes*, the Prophets, and the Pſalms, diſtinguiſhing the P*ſalms* from all other Scripture, as a peculiar book by it ſelf; And as when we are commanded to read the Law, and the Prophets, we cannot think them to be any other than the writings of *Moſes* and *Samuel*, and the reſt of the Prophets in the Old Teſtament; So when we are commanded to ſing Pſalms, not the Law or the Prophets, how can we imagine it unlawful to ſing that part of Scripture which is properly called the P*ſalms*, as the writing of *David*, *Aſaph*, &c? So the Apoſtle,

Acts 1.20. ſpeaking of *Judas* his fall, and ruin, ſaith, as it was written of him in the Book of the P*ſalms*, *Let his habitation be made deſolate*, &c. P*ſa.* 69.26. and in the 16. *verſe* (ſaith Peter) the holy Ghoſt by the *mouth of David* ſpake this concerning *Judas*, & *v.* 20. for it is written in the book of the P*ſalms*. *Acts* 2. *Acts* 25. and 29. inſtead of ſaying as in the P*ſalms*, he ſaith, *David* ſpeaketh of Chriſt thus and thus in P*ſal.* 16. *Acts* 13.33. ſpeaking of Chriſt again; he ſaith, *As it is written in the ſecond* P*ſalm*, and *v.* 35. *As it is written in another* P*ſalm*, which is the 16. By all which is clear what Chriſt and the Apoſtles would have us to underſtand by P*ſalms* (when we are commanded to ſing them (eſpecially theſe P*ſalms*, which are called the Book of the P*ſalms*; and there is no other P*ſalms* ſpoken of in the New Teſtament; and the holy Ghoſt is the beſt Expoſitor of his own commands. Now men muſt either deny theſe of *Davids*, (as before) to be P*ſalms*, or elſe they are bound to ſing them as for Hymns and Songs: they are comprehended under this general word (P*ſalms*) being all expreſt in the Book of the P*ſalms*, as hath been demonſtrated.

4. Let us conſider the vanity of the former opinion, in regard it utterly makes way for will-worſhip, which they ſeem to be ſo much againſt. For firſt, I am commanded to ſing Pſalms, Hymns, Songs: the Old and New Teſtament ſpeak of no other Pſalms than of *Davids* and *Aſaphs*, & of ſuch like inſpired perſons: and they are called the Pſalms of Chriſt and his Apoſtles

Apoſtles, but you muſt not ſing them (ſay they) I ask what Pſalms then muſt you ſing? there is no light in Old or New Teſtament to warant any other; either you muſt fancy a Pſalm, and ſay Chriſt meant this way, when he ſpake of the Book of the Pſalms, and deviſe a new way of worſhip out of your own brains, or elſe ſing theſe Pſalms, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles call Pſalms. Beſides, 2. How can any man perſwade himſelfe, or others, when he ſings, that he ſings a Pſalm, when he doth not ſing that which in Scripture is onely called a Pſalm? Or how can any man diſtinguiſh, now I ſing a Pſalm, now a Hymn, now a Song, when there is not one word in the New Teſtament to diſtinguiſh them one from another, or the two latter from the Book of the Pſalms? if any man from the New Teſtament can diſtinguiſh a Pſalm from a Hymn, or a Hymn from an Ode or Song, or any one from another, but as they borrow it from the Old Teſtament, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*; he ſhall be an Oracle I will conſult more than with Scripture. They tell us *Davids* Pſalms, and the like are not to be ſung: Chriſt and his Apoſtles call them ſpecially by the name of Pſalms, and command us to ſing Pſalms. Now let them ſhew us any other Pſalms from Scripture, and we are ſatisfied; but it's hard to be perſwaded from ſuch a pretious Ordinance, by a meer Negative, and the workings of a melancholy fancy, or the preſumption of a hot brain that he hath a gift of compoſing Pſalms, and Songs, and Hymns, for the edification of the Church.

Let us go on further, and try the Scripture examples; and begin with our Lord Jesus Christ and his Disciples, after the administration of his Supper; it is said in *Mat.* 26. 30. and *Mark* 14. 26, *when they had sung an hymn*, (or a P*salm* as the margent expresseth it,) and its all one, *they went forth to the mount Olivet*, the words are, καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος &c. Take it either as all Translators interpret, having sung an *Hymn*, Hymn *dicto Arab*: *They went forth*, or *they went forth Hymning*, (or singing of a P*salm*,) its not material: But 1. Its clear they sung openly with their voice. 2. They sung a P*salm* or *Hymn*; now what this Hymn should be, is the question, whether one of *Davids Psalms*, or any in that book; to which I answer: 1. Its onely said they sung an *Hymn* or P*salm*, and its most probable, yea demonstrative, that it was one of these P*salms*, or *Hymns* of *David* and the other Holy men, because Christ himself speaks of no other, as before: 2. Because Christ was so much prophesied of in these P*salms*, which were formerly sung prophetically, & with thanksgiving for these very acts before-hand. 3. Because Christ did still quote the same P*salms*, to prove both his Divinity and sufferings; so did his Apostles. Now it was no more dishonour, or unsuitable to Christ to sing with his Disciples one or more of these *Hymns* or P*salms*, than it was to prove himself, and his mediatorship by them, which he doth in all the former places, yea the very nature and manner of his sufferings. 4. We have Scripture

Scripture ground from Christs expression to believe the one, and only our own conjectures that he sung any other P*salms*, or *Hymns*; and that Christ both before and after his death should bring his choice proofs of his person, & humiliation, and glory from the book of the P*salms*, and when he was to suffer it should be found they sung a P*salm*, or *Hymn* and yet not one of these P*salms*, is very hard to press on a Scripture conscience, especially when the act expressed is in general, & the same word used for singing such P*salms*, and no other determination of it in the New Testament: let them but weigh things in an equal ballance of the Sanctuary & judge; yea, let them who are so high on the other side, shew us from Scripture what that *Hymn*, or P*salm* was, which Christ & his disciples sung after the Supper, and give us any place as a comment on it, & but the hint to our demonstration, & we shall think our selves well quit of such a mistake: in the mean while the argument stands thus untouched, Christ and his Disciples sung an *Hymn*, and Christ and the Apostles speak of no other *Hymns*, or P*salms*, but these recorded in the Old Testament, especially these in the book of the P*salms*; therefore they sung none other. And surely Christ would conform his practise to his expressions, or would have made some distinction.

The second great example of singing is that of Paul and Silas, *Acts* 16. 25. where it is said, *They sung a Hymn to God, or gave praises in the prison at midnight*: we are still on the same account as formerly, and ask

what this *Hymn* was they ſung, if not one of theſe P*ſalms* of Scripture which they might have choſen for this preſent condition? If any one can ſay it was an extemporary ejaculation, Let them ſhew us their proof; we ſhew them the Scripture-uſe of the word, and which was known to them; and theſe that oppoſe muſt have ſomething from the reaſon of the Text, or uſe of the Word to contradict us, and confirm themſelves; they did not barely ſing, but ὑμνεῖν τὸν θεὸν They ſung *Hymns*; and do not we go on ſurer grounds that ſing theſe P*ſalms* and *Hymns*, which in the *New* Teſtament Chriſt and his Apoſtles do call ſo, than what we imagine to be P*ſalms*, and *Himns*, &c. by an unſcriptural ſuppoſition? ſo that the ſumm of all may be drawn up thus to argue.

1. It is our duty to obey Divine commands; It is a command to ſing P*ſalms*, *Hymns*, *ſpiritual Songs*; *ergo*, it is our dudy.

2. It is a command to ſing P*ſalms Hymns*, *ſpiritual Songs*, as to the matter; but there is no other P*ſalms*, *Hymns*, or *Spiritual ſongs* mentioned in the Old or New Teſtament, but theſe which are penn'd by Holy men, inſpired to that end; *ergo*, it is our duty to ſing them.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

An Anſwer to that Objection concerning ſinging by a gift, not ſet Pſalms.

ONe ſpecial Objection that is made againſt ſinging Scripture-P*ſalms*, &c. is that it hinders the exerciſe of gifts, and ſo its but formal; all duties in the Church muſt be done from a gift.

Anſwer. 1. You ſee here is a duty laid on us, no ſuch limitation as from a gift.

2. The matter is preſcribed you, P*ſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, and to theſe you are eſpecially enjoyned: now the limitation of the matter limits the duty.

3. There is no promiſe of ſuch a gift in the Goſpel, to compoſe P*ſalms*, and *Hymns*; God hath provided matter ſufficient; there is a promiſe for the ſpirit of prayer and ſupplication, *Zach.* 12. and of preaching and propheſying, in *Joel*, repeated in *Acts* 2. but no diſtinct promiſe for a gift of ſpiritual Poetry, or Singing; for there are but three things required to ſinging, fit matter, a voice, and heart; all which may be performed without any ſuch ſpecial gift of compoſing; the matter, is ready, if the heart and voice be preſent.

4. It is a duty laid generally on the whole Church without any diſtinction of gifts; all are commanded to ſing, &c. Here is no hint of a gift required.

5. Chriſt

5. Christ would not ordain an Ordinance of such consequence, which the Churches should want the use of, some utterly, and not one among many should know what it means: for there is hardly one among a thousand of Saints which hath such a gift of composing *Psalms* and *Hymns*, &c. and if it be an Ordinance in one Church, all others may want it, and so be deprived of the comfort of such a sweet Ordinance for want of a pretended gift, when they have matter enough of praises before them.

6. It is lawfull to make use of the gifts of others, as well as to use our own; when a man hath a gift of prayer I joyn with him, and make use of his gifts. &c. So is it much more lawful to make use of the gifts of holy and blessed men in Scripture, who had that glorious gift of composing all sorts of *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *Spiritual Songs*, and when we sing them with melody in our hearts, we manifest all those treasures of the gifts of the Spirit, that breathed in these *Psalms*, &c. as if we had from a personal gift composed them our selves. for if we sing them with the same understanding, with the same inward affection of love, joy &c. we sing them with the same spirit

7. If there were such a gift promised, it would have been mentioned by Christ or his Apostles, as the gift of tongues and miracles were, and Saints would have been instructed to seek for it, and these that had it, would have been commanded to wait on it, as the Elders are on exhortation, teaching, ruling, the Deacons

Deacons on administring, and distributing, &c. *Rom.* 12. 6,7,8,9,10.

8. It is Antichristian to introduce an Ordinance to be practised among the Churches, which hath not been commanded by Christ & his Apostles, (these that differ, make much use of the word *Antichristian*) and cannot but grant this principle to be undeniable; now I assume but to introduce; A way of singing by a gift with casting off Scripture-*Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, was never commanded by Christ or his Apostles, *ergo*, it is Antichristian; the *minor* hath been proved before; there is no mention in the writings of Christ or the Apostles, of singing *Psalms* by a personal gift, or of a gift of composing *Psalms* either for our selves or the Church; neither is there mention of any other *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, as the matter to be sung, but such as are penn'd in Scripture, and left to be sung by all the Churches. Thus if men will bring in a new Ordinance, they must shew their authority from the Word, or else apply the word *Antichristian* to themselves.

For that expression in 1 *Corinth* 14. 26. *When you come together* (ἕκας ὑμῶν ψαλμὸν ἔχει) *every one hath a Psalm, hath a Doctrine*, &c. from whence they gather they had a gift of composing *Psalms* by the Spirit, which they were to sing in the Church, if they did it orderly.

To which I further answer, there is not any thing to explain what *Psalm* this was.

2. We have more reason to think it was one of these

Scripture-P*salms*, which the New Testament always called a P*salm* (as he saith, in the second P*sal.* and in another P*salm* as before) far from reason then they have to say it was a P*salm* of their own composing by a gift; every one hath a P*salm*, that is, this & the other have a P*salm*, that is one had this P*salm* in Scripture which he thought most proper, another, another of these P*salms*: for ἕκαστος is not to be taken universally of all, but singulary; one hath this, another that; thus some: but rather the meaning is, not as if one had this P*salm*, and another another; but one hath a P*salm*, another a *Doctrine*, another to speak with tongues, another to propheſie; now thus there was a confusion among them; one would have a P*salm* sung, another would have his *Doctrine*, or *word of construction* as most fit, another his *Revelation*. Now the Apostle onely tells them they might all be done one by one, and in order; he that had a P*salm* to be sung, might in its proper place, but this doth not prove that it was a P*salm* extemporarily composed, or by a personal gift, or that it was not one of the P*salms* in that which the Scripture calls the Book of the *Psalms*:

Object. If any say further, It must needs be from a gift, because it is joyned with other acts which were meerely from a gift, as *Doctrine*, *Tongues*, *Revelations*, *Prophecy*, *Interpretation*.

I Answer, of these things here named, some are accounted extraordinary, and peculiar, as gifts of *Tongues*, *Revelations*, fitted for these times; the other ordinary, as *Doctrine*, *Interpretation*, *Propheſie* (though some think this last extraordinary also) so having a P*salm* may be accounted ordinary, and not from an extraordinary gift as the gift of tongues was; however you must not make a particular argument from things of divers considerations and uses.

2. Other Scriptures have determined what a P*salm* is, and it may be easily gathered what it is in the *Corinthians* for one to have a P*salm*: we prove they had a P*salm*; let them prove what that P*salm* was, besides these Scripture-P*salms* onely mentioned in the New Testament.

It is most evident that the matter of singing is determined by the words of the Apostle, in *Colos.* 3. 16. *Let the word of God dwell richly in you*, &c. which in *Eph.* 5. is more in general, *Be filled with the Spirit*, which do not make any difference; for the Word and the Spirit must make up the melody in our hearts: but still the word of God is the matter to be sung with the Spirit, as it is the matter for reading, preaching, interpretation; but he here names that part of the word which belongs to the duty he enjoyns; as a special part of that word which ought to dwell richly in them, as to such a duty of singing: So that,

1. If P*salms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, be part of the word of God, then they may be sung.

2. If that part of the Word be more properly fitted to the duty commanded than any other, it must be so restrained here.

3. That

3. That it is ſo, appears, becauſe he ſpeaks ſo particularly, *That the word might dwell in them richly, teaching and admoniſhing one another*, not in *general*, as by Preaching, Doctrine, or the like; but in *Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *ſpiritual Songs*, which muſt needs be the great duty in the Text, and all before reſtricted to that.

4. Then the word of God in general, or any ſpeciall Word of God may be ſaid to dwell richly in a perſon, when the ſpiritual intent, ſenſe, and meaning of it, with the inward ſpirit, and power of it upon all occaſions doth appear in the duties commanded by it; and thus you may ſee the verſe in its parts.

1. Here is the duty, ſinging.

2. The Word of God, the matter.

3. The ſpecialty of the VVord ſo fitted to the nature of that duty, *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *ſpiritual Songs*.

4. The peculiar way how to be a perfect ſpiritual Singer: it is to have this word *dwell* in a man, and richly, having the true ſenſe, ſweet experience of this word in the heart, being upon all occaſions able to cull out in the language of Scripture, *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, ſutable to our own conditions or others.

If the Apoſtle had meant here a gift of compoſing new *Pſalms*, &c, as he would not have uſed the Old Teſtament language without an explanation; ſo he would not have mentioned the word of God in ſuch a cloſe limitation as in *Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*.

Songs, which are exegetical to the word of God to be ſung, if he had not intended that part of the VVord as fitted for that Ordinance; for no man knows what theſe expreſſions hold forth, but as they are found in the word of God, and as a diſtinct and eminent part of it. It were more proper to ſay, Let *the grace of God dwell in you*, or *the goodneſſe of God*, that you may from the ſenſe of it break forth upon all occaſions to praiſes. But to name the VVord of God, and name it with that modification, as Pſalms, Hymns, Songs, which we all know is a part of it, and bid us ſing, and deny us in his intention for to ſing theſe Pſalms which are part of that VVord, is too unworthy a reflection on the Holy Ghoſt, and the Penmen of Scripture. And that ſeems very ſtrange to affirm, that I may not ſing that VVord of God which is called by the name of *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, when this VVord muſt dwell in me richly to that end and uſe.

Laſtly, the ſinging of theſe *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, as the VVord of God is moſt adapt and proportioned to the particular uſe the Apoſtle intended by ſinging in the Church, which was to teach and admoniſh one another. Now no gift of any Saint can be ſo powerful, and authoritative to teach, as the Word of God in theſe *Pſalms*, which were penn'd by the ſpirit, as a rule to all Saints, and their gifts; and as the Word of God is made uſe of ſeveral ways to teach and admoniſh, ſo this is one ſpecial way, by *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, *Songs*. When I ſing by a pretended

gift, I see cause of jealousie, that it may be more a fancy than the spirit; every man hath cause of suspition from whence it comes, and ere I can be satisfied I must compare it with, and try it by the Scripture-strain of P*salms*, *Hymns* and *Songs*. But by singing the very words of Scripture with sense, and experience, I teach both by my holy carriage in the action, and the word it self commands by its own authority as when it is read.

But that I may more clearly open this, how that the Word of God in P*salms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, is the most fit matter of singing, let us view that part of the Word called by these names, and see how far it will reach this kind of edification, beyond all that which may come from a present gift to compose matter from such a duty.

1. Besides the spiritual elegancy of phrase, the inspired style of that part of holy writ, which is beyond ordinary with the height of matter, of no vulgar composure, it having such a standing stamp of Divine authority on it, must needs convey its sense with more weight and power, than any thing from particular invention, though assisted by a gift of the spirit, which comes but in the second place; and cannot be put in any consideration with that authority as the other, nor inserted among the heavenly Canons and Scripture-rules for Saints to build their faith on, or direct their lives.

2. The largnesse, and comprehensivenesse of the scope of the shortest Psalm, is so, that it will give matter

matter to study and ponder on, and give advantage to enlarge our thoughts and affections on more than any particular gift of any Saint now can be rationally conceived to afford; for commonly the best gifts are but an enlargement of the first text, and bring forth nothing *de novo*, no new thing, and all these Saints with all their gifts must be glad to have recourse to that part of the Word, as the rest, for the fullness of teaching and admonition.

3. The variety of matter in the P*salms*, &c. is so wonderfull, that they do provide before-hand by eternall wisdom, for the conditions of all Saints, either personally, or mystically, that no man sing any thing, but if that Word dwell in him richly, he may finde a sutable P*salm* prepared for him, by the foresight, and wise, and infallible directions of the Almighty; and in this, the *Book* of the Psalms transcends all other parts of Scripture, and may be called the Epitome of the whole Bible. In some Scriptures you have little but matter of precept, in others litle but historical relations of persons, and actions; but in the *Book* of the P*salms* you have the variety of matter conteined in all the whole Scripture, most suitable to the vast duty of singing praises.

1. Matter of all sorts of prophesies referring to the very latter end of the world.

2. All sorts of general and special directions, either for Faith or *Life*.

3. All sorts of promises fitted to particular conditions.

4. All ſorts of experiences in what condition a ſoul may be in, either of tryal or triumph, either to ſoul or body.

5. All ſorts of ſigns and characters of heavenly motions and frames to God.

6. All ſort of thankſgivings and prayſes for ſpiritual or temporal mercies, with their various diſcords which makes up the harmony of the whole. He is a child in the Scripture, that doth not admire the unparallel'd variety of truth in that Book, ſo that if I were raiſed by ſome extraordinary gift to the greateſt inlargement of compoſing a P*ſalm*, or *ſpiritual Song* on a ſpeciall occaſion, I ſhould come ſhort of the variety and fullneſs of the leaſt of theſe P*ſalms*, and yet the ignorant ſtanders by might more admire my giſt, and there would be more danger in it, than to ſing the Scripture P*ſalms* which have nothing from men to grace them but their own native majeſty and authority. And truly, it is ſomewhat odd for one to be ſet up by others, or for any one to be ſet up himſelf as a ſpiritual Poet in the Church, and the Church to ſing his thoughts, with the neglect of the Word of God, which is furniſhed with ſuch variety for the conditions of ſouls

And as the word of God in general is ſo large, and vaſt, and various, that all the Saints with their higheſt improvements can never come up to the fulneſs of it, and all the vaſt folio's that have been written by Commentators of all ſorts, have hardly peirced the bark, the ſhell, the letter, and all Saints of the higheſt

higheſt attainment, muſt dig in to it as the only viſible Mine, and we muſt not exclude the P*ſalms* as to ſinging from that fullneſs and variety, ſeeing Chriſt himſelf when he diſtinguiſheth the whole Scripture, gives the P*ſalms* an equal part.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Tranſlation of Davids Pſalms *and other* ſpiritual Hymns, *and* Songs, *with the Anſwer to the Objection ariſing from it.*

I Have endeavoured to prove the duty; let us conſider the ſtrength of the main Objections againſt it.

Ob The firſt in order is that which carps at the Tranſlation, & that into Meetre, as the humane invention; the Tranſlation (ſay they) is corrupt, and eſpecially as into Meetre, and Tune; if you will ſing *Davids* P*ſalms*, ſing them in Hebrew, as they were ſung formerly: thus they much ſtick on.

Sol. To which I anſwer, that in theſe Pſalms, and Songs, there was a ſet Meetre, fitted to Tunes, and Voices, & muſicall Inſtruments; none can deny that obſerves the Dedications of moſt Pſalms, and thoſe of underſtanding that can read learned *Gomarus* may ſee it fully, and with great exactneſs; where the ſpiritual poeſie of theſe Pſalms is excellently ſet forth

2. So

2. So far as there is corruption in the Translation it is spurious, and not to be approved of, but corrected.

3. But Translations according to the import of the words and sense of the Text, are as much the Word of God, as the Text in the original; for the coherence of word and sense make up the copy entire and perfect.

4. Which follows, the Translation of the words in Meetre, if it have the full sense of the words, is as much the Word of God, as if it were translated in prose, or ordinary sentence for reading; for it is not the way or method, but the sense & meaning of the words, that is the *Word* of God. So that I may as well say when I sing in such a composition, it is as much the *Word of God* as when I read the same words in the Bible, only they are orderly disposed for that action. None must by this reason, pretend to know the Word of God in reading or expounding, but he that knows the Hebrew, and Greek: and that must be also in the first perfect copy, immediately transcribed from inspired understandings; for all things besides are either translations, or additions, or substractions, from which two last comes perfect corruption.

So that a translation for singing, or reading, is the *same Word of God* as long as it hath the same substantial truth in it; and sing them which way you will either as they lie in the verse, or as the same verse digested into staves, and with musical notes, it is as one as to the nature of singing, and the translatio-

may be as Orthodox in Meetre, as in Prose; so that you see what force, efficacy, that objection from the translation carries with it; I confesse there are many defects in the translation into Meetre, but there are the like in som copies in prose, or continued sentence; but as to the nature of the thing, one verse may as well be made two, according to musical notation, and yet retain the same continued sense, as remain one, onely bounded by Arithmetical figures, as 1, 2, 3, &c.

Obj. But if any one say the Psalms, as thus translated into Meetre, are but an humane invention, and you worship God onely after an humane form.

Sol. The Answer is at hand.

1. To know the significancies of the tongues, and how to translate them to edification, is a special gift of Gods spirit, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29. 1 *Corinth.* 14. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

2. On this ground we read humane inventions when we read the Old or New Testament in any translation, but the first copies of Hebrew and Greek, wherein they were first written.

3. Is it not more a humane invention for to sing any thing of my own composing, then for to sing the very matter, and sense of the Word of God in my own tongue? and yet its usual among these that are against this Ordinance, to cry aloud, It is a humane invention, Antichristian.

4. The translation of the Scripture for to be read, is as much a humane invention, as in poesie to be sung; but this is an Objection urged for want of a better.

Obj. The next grand Objection is, that we may as well use a set form of Prayer, as of singing Psalms; the one is as lawfull as the other, the one stints the spirit as much as the other.

Sol. 1. There is no Divine holds that a set form of Prayer is absolutely unlawfull, for then no man may meditate before hand what he ought to pray for, nor consult with his own mouth, or Gods promises: for if I meditate on what I need, and what God hath promised, I form such petitions, and tie my self to them as necessary to be petitioned for, and it may be I may have no occasion for a long while to begg any thing of *God*, but the substance of these premeditated considerations of my want.

2. Here lies the unlawfulness of set form of prayer, that it is composed by one, and imposed by another, to which I am limited, let my wants be what they will, requiring further additions when I neither find in my own wants, nor am permitted to urge them to God in my prayer.

3. This is a more sutable Objection against those that pretend to sing by a gift, and do make Psalms, or Hymns, or Songs, for themselves and others, with neglect of inspired Psalms, and Hymns. So singing of Psalms, and using a set form of Prayer, are very nigh of kin, and hold much correspondency.

4. But to sing the very words of these Scriptures with understanding, is a command, as hath been formerly proved; and if you take a set form of praying for praying Scripture words, and speaking to God

God in that language, it is not only lawful, but is the excellency of some Saints, who seldom make a Petition, but they urge it in Scripture-dialect, and shew the Word of *God* to dwell richly in them; thus for singing to praise *God*, or sing to *God* in his own form of words in the spirit, and understanding, what can be more sutable to *God*, and sweet to the soul?

5. There is a great deal of difference between praying and singing, as to the method of performance, though praying and praises may be considered in the same duty, *yet praying and singing* require a distinct method; for the very words, to sing Psalms, and Hymns, and Songs, import a special method of the voice in a set tune, and proportion, whereas prayer in the method of performance requires no such exactness; if one should take on him to sing and not in a set form, and tune, he would be ridiculous to all hearers: but a man hath a larger liberty in prayer, and is not tyed to such strait connexions, heights and falls, stops, and pauses; but the nature of this Ordinance calls for it, else it cannot be done gracefully, though there be grace in the heart. And if the Apostle had not meant by singing of Psalms, singing *musically*, he would have onely bid them praise in the general, and have left out the outward expression of it, which cannot be acted but in a set form.

6. If singing were not in a musical manner, (as before) it were the same with prayer, for you may sing out a prayer, and praise in praying. Thus in *Davids*

Pſalms. How many Pſalms which were matter only of petition, yet were ſung with faith and confidence in God? For performance, the Apoſtle *James* diſtinguiſheth them apparently, *Is any ſick? let him pray; is any merry? let him ſing* Pſalms; and the other Apoſtle, *Let us pray with the Spirit, and underſtanding, and ſing with the ſpirit, &c.* Now wherein lies the difference? In prayer you have variety of workings, and conſiderations: there is *Deprecation, Imprecation, Acclamation* and *Admiring, pleading*, and *urging promiſe*, and the like. So in ſinging, there are the like: the difference is only in the ſet, and muſical way, of expreſſion, which requires a more ſet form before-hand to rule my outward carriage by, in that Ordinance; whereas in prayer we are not tied to ſuch a ſeverity of method, and ſo need not have our words ſo forged.

Another plea, which is ſomewhat ſcurrilous, by the ruder ſort, yet much urged, is, that we *lye* when we ſing Pſalms, and affirm that we cannot but *lye* when we ſing the phraſes of many Pſalms. As that of *David*, '*O Lord I am not puffed in minde, I am as a weaned child*' &c.

To which I reply, in general, that ſome may not have the frame of theſe expreſſions, when they ſing, and ſo may perform a duty which may be but as a lye to them. But,

1. In ſpecial, there is no Saint but can in ſome meaſure ſay whatever *David* ſaith in that or any other Pſalm, deſcribing the ſpiritual qualification of his

his heart; all graces are in every Saint there in the ſeed, and habit, and in a proportion, though all are not ſo eminent and apparent in the bud and fruit; though no godly man is free from pride, yet he cannot be a godly man that is a proud man *in actu ſignato*, which hath never been humbled, and brought out of himſelf; thus all along the 119. Pſalm, that Anatomy of a Saints inward parts, when *David* ſaith, *He delights in the Law of God, He hopes in Gods mercy, His ſoul longs after God, He keeps his Commandements, He hates every evil way*, &c. every godly man may ſing theſe and all other Pſalms, and ſpeak truth; for the reality of theſe frames are the ſame in every gracious heart.

2. Whatever I finde to be the caſe of any Saint, I may make it mine according to the likeneſs of my condition to it, and yet not a lye.

3. One great uſe of ſinging is to commend the excellency of ſuch graces which are and have been in others to ſweeten the harſhneſs of other duties, and to ſtir and quicken the heart to the endeavouring after ſuch like frames: therefore ſome Law-givers have put their Laws into verſe ſirſt, that the people might take a pleaſure in them, and ſing them as their recreations, and be the more inſinuated into obedience.

4. I can tell no lye ſo long as in the ſincerity of my ſoul I ſtudy my duty, and ſing with deſire after ſuch qualifications from the contemplation of the beauty of them in ſuch holy men, though I do not finde the

preſent frame ſo high as I breath after, and ſuch men found at preſent.

Ob. But this Objection, grant it in its full latitude, proves nothing againſt the nature of the Ordinance of ſinging, but the perſons who ſing, who are not fitly qualified to ſome expreſſions.

Again, others plead, Pſalms that are ſung are not ſutable to my condition.

Sol. 1. That is nothing ſtill againſt the Ordinance of ſinging; if it do not fit you, it fits others. But,

2. There is nothing in Scripture-expreſſions but all Saints at all times may make ſome uſe of in the very reading or ſinging, if not ſo particularly yet as to the general nature of inſtruction and edification, it is profitable: Saints muſt read all Scripture, with faith and underſtanding; though every place may not ſo directly open their preſent condition; and why may not they ſing as well all Pſalms?

3. It ſhould be the care of Officers in the Church, to uſe very choice in picking out Pſalms fit for the Church, according to the nature of the body, and times, and ſeaſons; and I could wiſh there were more choiceneſs obſerved in that particular; yet the Ordinance remains ſtill the ſame.

4. When I ſing any of theſe Pſalms, I ſhould by Faith perſonate the ſame ſtate of the Church, or the Saints, as when I apply promiſes made to others, I do their conditions, as if it were ſpoken to me.

5. It is for want of Divine ſtudy of the nature of theſe

theſe Scripture-expreſſions, and the myſtery of them that we ſay ſuch a Pſalm is unſuitable to our conditions; for if when I read underſtandingly, I can get profit by them, I can the ſame when I ſing them.

6. If it do not reach my condition, as to a particular caſe I am troubled withall, or the providence I am eminently under; yet it concerns the ſtate of the Church, and I may ſing them as a Member of the ſame body, and ſympathiſing with them either in ſorrow or joy, in afflictions or triumphs; which is a ſpecial way to act the graces of Saints, ſometimes to ſing what concerns others as themſelves; as to pray for others as themſelves; this is like Chriſts heart in heaven.

Laſtly, You have opportunity enough to chuſe Pſalms for your emergencies. It is good to keep the harmony of the whole Body in the main.

Ob. That which follows next as urged againſt this truth, is, that its confuſion to ſing together, and that but one ſhould ſing at one time.

Sol. Still this is not againſt the Ordinance of ſinging. But,

1. Singing is more melodious and ſuitable, when performed by many, than one ſeveral inſtrument at one time: and ſo ſeveral voices make the greater Harmony: the excellency of ſinging lies in the Church, which is made up of divers voices.

2. Chriſt and his Diſciples ſung together, *Mat.* 26. 30. ὑμνήσαντες, they ſung, *Paul* and *Silas*, Act 16. 25. *ſung together in the Priſon*, not one after another but together.

Obj. But if any one say, when one prayes, all may be said to pray, though he doth but consent; it may be so in singing of Psalms.

It is answered, 1. All Ordinances must be considered according to their proper nature: some Ordinances are so to be administred, as that onely one at once can perform it, as publick prayer, and preaching, and yet there must be a distinction even in these: my silence in prayer ought to be when I pray with another, and yet I may be said to pray aswell as he which is the mouth of the whole, because my heart is with him in the same petitions, and my desires go equally with him: but it is not so in preaching, where silence must be likewise from the nature of the Ordinance; yea though I consent fully with the matter, and agree to all that is said with never so much affection, yet I cannot be said to preach, but onely he that speaketh or teacheth. So now as to singing there is a difference likewise of another consideration; if onely one sing, so I can be said to sing, though they joyn with the matter and agree to it in their hearts; for its an outward act, and terminated in the person that performs it: and though in my silent conjunction, I may really praise God, yet I can in no sense be properly said to sing with others, without I do use my Voice and Organs as they do. This consideration will give light to men that mind the nature and distinction of Ordinances in their outward administrations.

2. That which is the confusion of other Ordinances, is the beauty of this; for two to preach, or pray

pray together at the same time and place, were the greatest confusion imaginable; but for an hundred to sing together is most harmonious, and pleasant, so far from the breach of order, that harmony is most discovered by it.

3. It hath been the custome of the Churches always thus to practice; and there is nothing in the nature of the Ordinance, or Divine precept, or example against it. I shall conclude this with a word from Antiquity concerning this practice.

Euseb. in his *Eccles. Hist* lib. 3. cap. 33. quotes two Epistles of *Plinius Secundus* to *Trajan* the Emperour testifying that Christians were wont to gather themselves before day to sing Psalms and Hymns together. the same doth *Philo Judæus* testifie, who lived in the Apostles time, as the same *Euseb.* saith, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 22. Now in the time of *Plinius* and *Trajan*, did *John* the beloved Disciple live, saith *Zanch.* in *Eph.* 5. 18. 29. whereby it appears an Apostolical Institution.

Tertul. in his *Apol. c.* 19. saith, that it was a usuall custome among the Christians, after their Love-feasts, *canere de Scripturis Sanctis*, to sing of the Scriptures; his meaning is, doubtless, out of, or from the Scriptures: In the Western Churches this hath been the constant practice, though much corrupted by the *Roman* additions to Saints method: but yet that blessed Ordinance is now more specially recovered, and made pure for Saints according to primitive institution.

CAP.

CHAP. V.

The great abuſes of the Roman *and* Epiſcopal *Church about this Ordinance, whereby many ſtick not to call it Antichriſtian, hath been;*

1. THe introducing muſical Inſtruments together with, as Organs, Harps, Viols, &c. whereas in the New Teſtament God requires the Voice as the only Organ of the heart in worſhip.

2. They had a meer order of Singers to whom they gave penſions unto for that purpoſe, & excluded the Church from the perſons of that duty, which is of ſo Univerſal a concernment.

3. They would ſing in Latin, and with ſuch ſtrains of their Voices, that the words might not be underſtood.

4. They ſpent moſt of the time in ſinging, and gave not other Ordinances, as preaching, and praying, their due time of exerciſe. Thus have precious Ordinances been abuſed by the corruptions of men; but are now reſtoring unto their purity, and will every day be more glorioufly practiſed in the Churches.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

How we may be ſaid to teach and admoniſh one another, in Pſalms, Hymns, *and* Songs, *according to that of* Col. 3.16,17.

MAny think there can be no ſuch uſe of ſinging, as to teach and admoniſh one another by it; but if we conſider, there are many leſſons to be learnt one another from this publique conjunct ſinging Scripture Pſalms.

1. They teach one another, and by the very act admoniſh one another to get the ſame frames the Holy men had in the penning the Pſalms, and in the variety, and ſpirituality of them; to get *Davids* frame, in ſinging *Davids Pſalms:* and ſo for the reſt.

2. Its by this they teach one another the Unity & Harmony that is and ſhould be among Saints as one body, that their happineſs and joys are bound up together, & ſo the miſery of one, is the miſery of the whole; and this is a glorious leſſon to know their Union together, as a body equally concerned in the glory, or ſhame of one another, equally intereſted in the praiſes of God; there is no duty practiſed in all the Goſpel that doth fully expreſſe the Communion of Saints, and repreſent Heaven, as the Saints ſinging together, the Lords Supper doth repreſent the Communion of Saints very lively, but not ſo as mutuall ſinging,

singing, when all at once, not by consent onely, but expresly speak the same thing in the same moment: in the Lords Supper, though afterwards they were all one bread, yet they all do not receive it at the same instant of time, but take successively the Elements: but in singing they all joyn perfectly at once to sound Gods praises, as if they had but one Lip, and one Voice. This is the perfect Emblem of Heaven, no jarring, all with one Voice and Heart, crying, *Hallelujah. Hallelujah.*

3. They teach one another this lesson also, *viz* with what alacrity and cheerfulnesse they should perform all their duties together; with sweetnesse of love, and joy they ought to walk together.

4. They teach one another how to carry themselves in all conditions with joyfull and praising frames of spirit, for matter of the Psalms; and are various not only affording matter of exultation, and gratulation: but also reciting the sadnesse and low condition of the Church; yet all are fit matter to be sung: *Lachrymæ* must be sung, sad things with a spiritual joyfull heart in God and his promises: mercy, and judgment in the same song, expresst in melody of the Voice and Heart, and it shews a soul is not in a right temper when he cannot sing over his condition.

5. They teach one another by singing, and admonish one another to avoid any thing that may hinder their joys in Communion, and break their Harmony in Spiritual actings; all which, and many more are

are great exhortations, and are taught naturally by Saints mutual singing together.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning singing with a mixt multitude.

MAny who grant singing to be an Ordinance among Saints, yet stumble to sing in promiscuous manner with others; especially because there are so many Psalms of such composition that doth not seem to concern a mixt multitude.

For opening of this, I must lay down this generall position; that prayer and praises are natural duties belonging to al men, men as men; though only the Saints can do them best, and spiritually; it lies upon all men by the *Law* of Creation, to seek to God for what they want, & to thank him for what they have: this is due unto God, owning him as a Creator, and Benefactor; and though singing be a part of instituted worship, yet its onely an addition of Order, & a regulation of a naturall duty. And as there is no man but is bound to pray for mercies, so none are exempted from praising God for mercies, though they sing in a lower tune then Saints. Thus *David* calls in all creatures to bless & praise God, as a natural duty according to their several capacities. *Psal.* 136. *Psal.* 117. *Psal.* 107. *Psal.* 103. *Psal.* 20, 21, 22. Praises, its the natural duty of all, the proper duty of Saints, the perfect act of Angels.

Or

Ob. You will say they cannot perform it aright, and glorifie souls.

Sol. 1. Their want of ability doth not discharge them from such a duty engraven on their consciences, and arising from the natural respects they have to God as a Creator; to perform which, God gave full power at first.

2. Let every man do his duty conscientiously, he may afterwards come to do it spiritually; though I should lose the sense of a duty in my conscience, yet the duty lyes on my conscience from *Gods* authority and my relation to him.

1. By the same rule every one should abstain from performance of a duty for want of present ability, whereas the duty must be done, and the strength expected from *Heaven*, and waited for according to the Divine manner of dispensation.

2. Its not unlawfull to joyn in any act with others or to countenance them in it, which is really their duty as well as our own; I cannot sin in joyning with any one in that act to perform, which is the duty of another, as mine, though he may want the present ability.

For duties must be measured according to the rule, not the abilities of the performer; now its no duty for any man to receive the Lords Supper, or be a Member of a Church in order to Communion, without he find himself in some measure fitted for grace these sealing Ordinances of the Gospel, suppose, & require some other qualification, & are peculiar to visible

visible Saints; but where there is a natural Character, or an Ordinance as to the substance of it, at least equally concerning all; there it is no sin to joyn in the administration of it; and if we consider of it warily, unregenerate men are great sharers in the mercies of the Churches; besides their own particular, that they may well afford their voice without sin, and we joyn with them in setting forth *Gods* praises: But more closely, and particularly.

1. When the Church and Saints of God are gathered together to worship him, in singing; it is no more unlawfull to sing with others that stand by and joyn their voices, than when in prayer they stand by, and give their consent, we do not so much joyn with them as they do own *Gods* actings among us: it is no sin in them to joyn with us in such a duty, neither can it be any sin in us to sing, though others very carnal will outwardly praise God with us.

2. The carriage of Saints in their hearty and real expressions of prayses may convince others in the coldness, and lowness of their spirit, and stir them up to some spiritual apprehensions.

3. Though it be lawful to joyn with them in such a duty generally considered, yet it were to be wished in a mixt multitude, there were more care in the choice of Psalms, to fit them to the very duty of praise and thanks, which is so really belonging to all the Congregation: & that must be lamented, that the choice of Psalms, to a mixt multitude, is not so con-

sider

sidered as it ought to be, which makes the ordinance so much slighted in its publique administration. But however, the incapacity of others to their duty, should not hinder me from performing mine, especially when I cannot, nor ought not to hinder others from such an act.

FINIS.